DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 404 HE 007 921

AUTHOR	Liss, Lora
TITLE	The Status of Women at Fairleigh Dickinson University. A Report.
INSTITUTION	Fairleigh Dickinson Univ., Rutherford, N.J.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	211p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal reproducibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Academic Rank (Professional); Administrative Personnel; *Affirmative Action; College Faculty; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Degrees (Titles); *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Fringe Benefits; Grade Point Average; *Higher Education; Males; Marital Status; Nondiscriminatory Education; Personnel Policy; Salaries; *Sex Discrimination; Teacher Promotion; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Fairleigh Dickinson University

ABSTRACT

It was against a background of general societal concern for the status of women and the development of an Affirmative Action Plan at Fairleigh Dickinson University that the Status of Women study was undertaken. Preliminary statistical data revealed a pattern similar to the national findings of differential salaries, rank, and tenure for women, relative to male colleagues. While the percentage of women on faculties has been found to be smallest at the "elite institutions," it is of interest that at a four-year, "non-elite," private university, such as Fairleigh Dickinson, the percentage of women on the faculty still does not exceed 20.5 percent. Of a total of 488 faculty members in 1972-73, 100 were women. Information was also collected in the study regarding: perceptions of discrimination, sex awareness in career choice, marital status, preferred activities, departmental differentiation, personnel decisions, university policies and benefits, professional development, and the women's movement. The most striking finding of the indepth interviews was the proportionately low amount of perceived discrimination among women who have clearly been "tracked" along a second-class route to academic success. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125404

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A REPORT:*

THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY

Prepared for
Fairleigh Dickinson University's
Office of Institutional Research

by

Lora Liss
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
College of Liberal Arts
Teaneck-Hackensack Campus
Fairleigh Dickinson University

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007921

February 1973 - March 1974

*(This document is an internal, working report for Fairleigh Dickinson University.)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply appreciative of the supportive services given by Charlotte Frankel, Research Assistant.

The measurements of this discontent are not to be found in the individual's estimation of whether or not she was discriminated against or treated differently because of her sex. With rare exceptions, none will ever really know. Those women who have given little conscious thought to the possibility of discrimination will never be aware of the subtle ways in which it molds their lives. They will either be satisfied with their lot or will attribute such dissatisfaction they may feel to personal failings and extraneous causes. Those who are conscious are doomed to live in a world of everlasting doubt. For it is the very inability to know whether a particular act by a particular person was an act of discrimination which makes being a woman in this society and on this campus so damning and so damaging. To go through life never really knowing whether one is seen primarily as an individual or as a category; to engage in one's work with questions as to how much it will be judged strictly on its merit and how much as the product of a member of a group; to be unable to say that one is treated the same as others without hidden bias—these uncertainties in themselves wreak their own havoc regardless of what the real situation may be. It is because of these uncertainties that an avowedly sex-blind attitude is not sufficient. The University, its students, and its faculty are all part of society. For the University to say it ignores general social attitudes is only to reinforce them. They must be deliberately and effectively countered or they will continue to impose themselves on all of us. The result will not only be a loss of talent to the University, but an even greater loss to women themselves.

Jo Freeman

(Excerpt from "Women in the University of Chicago. Report of the Committee on University Women," Chicago University, Illinois, May 1, 1970, p. 122. ERIC Report No. 041537.)

HIGHLIGHTS OF STATUS OF WOMEN STUDY

- As few women occupy the top rank at Fairleigh Dickinson University as men occupy the bottom rank.
- No campus is exempt from manifestations of discrimination in rank-- Madison, fewest Professors; Rutherford, most Instructors; Teaneck, highest proportion of Assistant Professors.
- Women in the lowest ranks perceived the least amount of discrimination.
- Higher ranked women tend to be more aware of women clustering at bottom levels.
- Few married women were aware of differences in career-home burdens between men and women.
- Lack of sex awareness marked choices of major, career or graduate school.
- Role models are essential to stop channeling women into "female" fields and to open alternative life sequence.
- Whether single or married, women suffered sex discrimination.
- Young married women need societal acceptance of childlessness or aid with child-rearing.

- Pro-rated, part-time full status positions are essential to encourage married women with children to pursue their career.
- Women faculty prefer teaching over writing, research or committee work.
- Women need encouragement to serve as department heads, on important committees, obtain grants or publish.
- Political favoritism is more widely perceived by women faculty than sex discrimination.
- Advisement falls more heavily on women than men within departments of the University, whereas reimbursed or more prestigious activities accrue more to men.
- Office space, secretarial help and office equipment are more generous in male-dominated departments and often to males within mixed departments.
- Men were elected 9 out of 10 times to committee positions--except secretary!
- Even women chairpersons suffered social inequalities.
- Women are caught between the desire to be feminine, and the need to be aggressive.
- Men are preferred at initial hiring. . . . Women's salaries are lower initially.

- Men get promoted even when they are less qualified than women.

- Women are less knowledgeable about how to negotiate for themselves.

- Women are perceived not to need money, promotion or tenure as much as men.
- Pluralistic ignorance prevails, preventing class consciousness from arising.
- "Hire a Teaneck housewife with a Ph.D."--paradigm for sex discrimination.
- "Women are invisible in administration."
- "Women are not supposed to want promotion. They are held at Assistant Professor rank, while men without the doctorate are promoted."
- Women get terminated for being too impressive.
- Fifteen per cent of the respondents had fought termination and won.

- Women believe that no special efforts are being made to locate women for faculty or administrative posts.
- Over the past five years, the proportion of initial hirings of women has declined.

- Proportionately far more women are hired at the Instructor level than at any higher level.
- The Ph.D. is of virtually no advantage to women; while it correlates with male promotion, it holds no such indication for women. Lack of the doctorate, however, exposes women to far greater penalties than men.
- The average salary differential between men and women at Fairleigh Dickinson University in 1972-73 was $2,198.00 or 12.4 per cent. The largest gap was at Teaneck, with $2,946.00; Madison, $1,867.00; and Rutherford, $1,351.00.
- Over 5 years, there is no rank at any campus where women's average salaries have matched men's average salaries.
- Neither age, years in rank, or the doctorate explain the difference in salaries between men and women.
- The chances of a woman gaining tenure are less likely than a man, since few faculty at Instructor or Assistant rank receive tenure.
- The under-representation of women is maintained through low initial appointments, high termination rates and few women given tenure.

- Fewer women than men tend to take their cases to grievance.
- Anti-nepotism policies were favored by women to end political "cronyism" but not to prevent faculty wives from holding full-time positions.
- Liberalization of policies affecting maternity leave, sick leave, hospitalization and equal benefits for men and women in pension and retirement plans, were favored by most women.
- Women who felt men had easier access to travel to conferences, leaves, sabbaticals, research grants and publication, attributed it to women's greater responsibility for home and family and to the "buddy" system favoring men.
- Most women felt the women's movement had improved the awareness of the status of women in academe.

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Earned Degrees and First-Time Enrollees in Institutions of Higher Education by Level of Study and Sex: 1970 2

2. Grade Point Average During First Year of College by Sex: 1966-1967 (In percentages) 3

3. Undergraduate Grade Point Averages of American Graduate Students in Ph.D. Programs, by Sex (In percentages) 4

4. Academic Rank Distribution by Sex and Total Faculty, National Sample, 1969 (In percentages) 10

5. Women as a Percentage of Faculty Members in Four-Year Colleges and Universities 10

6. Number and Average Salary of Full-Time Instructional Faculty on 9 - 10 Month Contracts in Institutions of Higher Education, by Level of Institution, Rank and Sex, 1972-73 Privately Controllled Institutions, Fifty States and D.C. 13

7. Distribution of Women and Men Full-Time Faculty, 1972-73 (In percentages) 19

8. Perceptions of Discrimination Among Full-Time Women Faculty at Fairleigh Dickinson University 24

9. Median Salaries of Full-Time Faculty, 1972-1973 25

10. Rank Correlated with Perceived Discrimination 27

Table Page

11. Perceptions of Sex Awareness in Career Choice Correlated with Degree of Perceived Discrimination, by Campus 32

12. Distribution of Initial Appointments by Sex, Rank, and Campus 1968-69 Through 1972-73 83

13. Distribution of Continuing Appointment by Initial Appointment Between Men and Women Faculty 1969-1973 86

14. Distribution of Faculty Promotions Between Women and Men 1968-69 Through 1972-73 87

15. Comparison of Full-Time Faculty Women and Men Who Got Promotion (Compared to Total Facutly) With and Without the Ph.D. by Campus 1969-69 Through 1972-73 90

16. Standard Deviation of Women and Men Promoted Among Full-Time Faculty, by Time in Rank, 1972-73 91

17. Average Salaries for Full-Time Faculty by Campus and Sex 1968-69 Through 1972-73 93

18. Distribution of Average Salaries Between Men and Women by Rank 1968-69 Through 1972-73 94

19. Distribution of Selected Ranges of Faculty Salary Levels Among Men and Women, 1972-73 94

20. Distribution of Selected Age Ranges Between Men and Women by Rank, University-Wide, 1972-73 97

21. Comparison of Total Years Faculty Service, Men and Women by Rank, 1972-73 100

22. Distribution of Doctorate-Holders Among Men and Women Full-Time Faculty by Rank, 1972-73 102

23. Percentage Distribution of Tenure Among Faculty Men and Women by Rank, 1972-1973 104

Table Page

24. Summary of Faculty Who Left the University (Not Including Death) by Rank and Sex 1968-69 Through 1972-73 106

25. Outcome of Grievances by Sex 1969-70 Through 1972-73 108

Appendix Tables

1A. Percentage of Full-Time Faculty Women Interviewed 160

2A. Respondents' Rank: Per Cent of Women Respondents 160

3A. Respondents' Tenure 161

4A. Respondents by Salary 162

5A. Respondents by Age 163

6A. Respondents by Marital Status 164

7A. Respondents by Number of Children 165

8A. Number of Children at Home 166

9A. Respondents by College 168

10A. Respondents' Degree 169

11A. Respondents' Time in Rank 171

12A. Respondents' Years at Fairleigh Dickinson University 172

13A. Respondents' Publications 173

14A. Respondents' Research 174

15A. Respondents' Fellowships and Assistantships 175

Table Page

16A. Distribution of Promotions Between Men and Women Faculty 1968 to 1973 177

17A. Distribution of Promotions of Men and Women With Ph.D. 1968-69 Through 1972-73 179

18A. Full-Time Faculty Who Got Promotion by Rank 1968-69 Through 1972-73 180

19A. Comparison of Total Years Faculty Service Men and Women by Rank, by Campus 1972-73 185

Table of Contents

I Background..1

II Institutional Barriers to Women as Students..............6

III Institutional Barriers to Women as Faculty...............8

IV Federal Guidelines for Affirmative Action...............15

V Purposes of Study..17

VI Delimitations...21

VII Description of Procedures..............................22

VIII Sample Responding to Interview........................23

IX Perceptions of Discrimination...........................23

A. Rank Correlated with Perceived Discrimination........26

X Sex Awareness in Career Choices..........................28

A. Summary of Sex Awareness Responses...................36
B. Recommendations......................................37

XI Marital Status..38

A. Summary of Marital Status Responses..................47
B. Recommendations......................................47

XII Preferred Activities...................................49
A. Summary of Preferred Activities Responses............54
B. Recommendations for Faculty Activities...............55

XIII Departmental Differentiation..........................56
A. Summary of Departmental Differentiation Responses....65
B. Recommendations for Departmental Assignments.........67

XIV College and University Service.........................68
A. Summary of College and University Service Responses..75
B. Recommendations for College and University Service...76

XV Personnel Decisions.....................................77
A. Patterns of Perception...............................78
B. Wider Sampling of Perceptions........................83
C. Comparative Data for Men & Women Faculty.............87
  1. Initial Appointments...............................87
  2. Continuing Appointments............................90
  3. Promotion..92
  4. Salary...97
    a. Age...102
    b. Years at FDU....................................105
    c. Doctorate.......................................107
    d. Summary of Salary Variables.....................109
  5. Tenure..109
  6. Leaving the University............................111

D. Overview of Perceptions and Actual Status of Women....113
E. Summary of Personnel Decisions Responses..............114
F. Recommendations for Personnel Practices...............116
XVI University Policies and Benefits......................121
A. Nepotism...121
B. Maternity leave....................................125
C. Sick leave...129
D. Loss of Seniority..................................132
E. Life Insurance.....................................133
F. Hospitalization....................................135
G. Retirement...138
H. Social Security....................................141
I. Recommendations on Fringe Benefits in General.........144
XVII Professional Development..............................144
A. Sabbaticals..145
B. Travel to Conferences..............................148
C. Research and Publications..........................148
D. Grants...151
E. Recommendations....................................152

XVIII Women's Movement....................................153
A. Reactions to Interview.............................156

XIX Summary...158

Appendix

Footnotes

Background

Higher education for women has been available in the United States since the middle of the nineteenth century. But women have never had more than a tentative foothold in academe except as tuition paying undergraduate students. The overriding fact concerning women in academe is their under-representation among graduate students, faculty and administrators.[1]

The attrition of women pursuing higher education begins immediately after high school graduation. Table 1 shows that 50.4% of high school graduates are women but they comprise only 44.7% of college freshmen; 43% of those earning bachelor's degrees; 39.6% of those earning master's degrees; and 13.3% of those earning doctoral degrees.[2]

While there is some approximation of balance up to and including the M.A. line, just at the demarcation point for academic achievement, the proportion of women completing higher degrees falls off.

Table 1. Earned Degrees and First-Time Enrollees in Institutions of Higher Education by Level of Study and Sex: 1970

Earned Degrees and Enrollment	Total	Men	Women	Percent Women
High school graduates, 1969-1970	2,906,000	1,439,000	1,467,000	50.4
First-time enrollees in institutions of higher education, 1970	1,775,158	981,154	794,004	44.7
Bachelor's degrees requiring four or five years, 1969-1970	792,316	451,097	341,219	43.0
Second-level (master's) degrees, 1969-1970	208,291	125,624	82,667	39.6
Doctoral degrees (Ph.D., Ed.D., Eng.D., Sci.D.) 1969-1970	29,866	25,890	3,976	13.3

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare 1972: 51, 69, 90. (p. 56 Rossi for citation)

Factors other than intelligence must then be responsible, since proportions up to and including the M.A. remain closely in balance. Because the Ph.D. is considered the sine qua non of academic achievement, forces which suppress the achievement of the Ph.D. must be in operation within the University and operate to discourage women from pursuit of the Ph.D..

This attrition cannot be attributed to inferior academic performance. The American Council on Education has conducted surveys which show that women's high school academic records are consistently superior to those of male high school graduates. Far more women than men have averages of B plus or better or were in the top quarter of their class. [3]

This record of academic achievement continues into college (28.6% of freshmen women earned a grade point average of B or higher compared to 19.6% of freshmen men.)

Table 2. Grade Point Average during First Year of College by Sex: 1966-1967

Gr. Pt. Avg.	All Inst. m	All Inst. w
A- or better	3.9	5.4
B or B+	15.7	23.2
B-	14.0	16.5
C+	22.1	22.0
C	34.3	27.6
D	9.9	5.2

Source: Bayer et al. 1970:19
(p. 42 Rossi)

The same pattern continues into graduate school. Among women graduates in 1969 who went on to graduate school, 37% of women compared to 26% of men had undergraduate grade point averages of A- or better.[4]

Table 3. Undergraduate Grade Point Averages of American Graduate Students in Ph.D. Programs, by Sex.

Undergraduate Grade Point Average	Men	Women	Total
A or A+	9.7	13.8	10.7
A-	16.2	23.1	17.9
B+	22.6	29.4	24.2
B	18.0	16.6	17.7
B-	17.1	10.7	15.5
C+	13.4	5.7	11.5
C or below	2.9	0.8	2.4

Source: Creager 1971:45
(p. 42 Rossi)

The recently issued Carnegie Commission Report on Opportunities for Women in Higher Education states the extent of our deplorable waste of human resources.

> A substantial proportion of the intellectual talent of women has been and is being lost to society as a result of cultural circumstances. Men are given comparatively more opportunities to use their mental capacities.

> The supply of superior intelligence is limited and the demand for it in society is ever greater. The largest unused supply is found among women.[5]

Our society has channeled women from early childhood toward women's traditional role - marriage and children - and away from professional achievement. Conditioning has nurtured the illusion that the two options are mutually exclusive and if women try to combine family and career, one area or both will suffer. Women from minority groups and/or lower socio-economic status are more traditionally oriented and confronted by even greater hurdles in acquiring higher education. Inner-directed women who have defied the conventional wisdom and persisted in pursuit of professional goals often find that they and their aspirations are not taken seriously. Discrimination against them assumes forms as subtle as the use of the generic term "man", which makes women invisible, and as overt as demanding that women meet higher standards of performance for lower salaries than their male colleagues in academe.[6]

The societal demands on academic women have been more burdensome than those on their male counterparts. Women have had responsibility for the physical care of their families and also for the discharge of their professional responsibilities at the level of performance and productivity expected of men. Women, in effect, have performed two full-time jobs and are expected to be grateful for the opportunity to perform the one outside the home. Such demands have led to role ambivalence, time fragmentation and have constantly placed women at the center of the home-career conflict.

This conflict has fluctuated slightly over the years, depending on society's woman-power priorities at a given time, including pursuit of the doctorate. Yet, in relative terms, women have lost ground in the percentage of doctoral degrees granted in the last fifty years. In the early 1920's women were granted 16% of all doctorates. The high of 20.4% was reached in 1945 and fell to a low of 9% during the home-centered 1950's.[7]

Institutional Barriers to Women as Students

In addition to barriers raised by female conditioning, academic institutional barriers have been raised against women.

Admission standards are generally higher for women than for men at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.[8]

Financial aid is more readily given to men than to women. One national survey of 1969-70 college sophomores who were full-time students found that even when financial aid was awarded to women by institutions, it averaged $518.00 for women compared to $765.00 for men.[9]

At the graduate level, women graduates are often outside the informal channels through which word of available fellowship and grant funds is spread. Through lack of awareness of opportunity, women do not apply in numbers relative to their qualifications. In 1972-73 about 80% of the nation's most prestigious fellowships and awards went to men. Women were also under-represented on selection committees. Many had no women members.[10]

Part-time students are almost automatically cut off from any financial assistance. This discriminates against women who would like to combine study with raising a family and against the increasing number of young husbands and wives attempting to share familial responsibilities equally. Practically all federal scholarship and loan aid goes only to full-time students.[11] Even though women fellowship applicants are more qualified than male applicants as a group, they are much less likely to be recipients of fellowship aid.[12]

Student Counseling. College advisors have been known to counsel women away from rigorous, "masculine" courses of study (i.e., business administration, engineering, medicine and dentistry). This has led to sex-segregated departments and sex-stereotyping of certain professions and an absence of female role models in these areas.

In some cases women have been counseled away from advanced work of any kind and therefore away from professionalism.

Campus services directed to women's needs have been largely ignored. These include gynecological services in University health centers and child care centers.

Curriculum has subjected women to a concentrated dosage of material filtered through an exclusively male perspective. Sociology, history, economics, psychology, literature and religion have largely overlooked the oppression of women and their human needs and ignored their initiative and creativity.

> College and University professors place heavy emphasis on the culture and achievements of white males, which may contribute to the motivation of white male students, but dampens the motivation of blacks and women who hear instead the implicit message: 'You do not belong among those who make important decisions for or significant contributions to society... If you try to become something other than a housewife or low-income worker you will be unsuccessful.' 13

Institutional Barriers to Women As Faculty

As a faculty member the academic woman encounters discrepancies in relation to her male colleagues in the following areas: percentage of faculty, employment levels, promotion, salaries, tenure and cronyism.

Percentage of faculty. Nationally women comprise 19% of college faculty even though the base recruitment pool from which aspiration to professorship would occur contains almost one-half females. (Supra, Table 1) At "elite" schools their number is only about 9%. When a given institution has undertaken to determine whether women are under-represented, there has been a tendency to make the comparison with comparable schools. This, in turn, tends to reinforce the preconception that since others are similar, the situation here is justified. Thus, the cycle continues and comparisons tend to reinforce the status quo.[14]

Rank. The distribution by academic rank of men and women differs sharply.

Table 4. Academic Rank Distribution by Sex and Total Faculty, National Sample 1969 (in percentages)

Rank	Men	Women	Total
Professor	24.5	9.4	21.6
Associate Professor	21.9	15.7	20.7
Assistant Professor	28.2	28.7	28.3
Instructor	16.3	34.8	19.9

Source: Bayer 1970:13; P. 208 Rossi

While the percentage of men in each rank is nearly equal, 60% of women are clustered below the rank of Associate Professor. Table 5 shows that the proportion of women at the Instructor level has increased between 1959 and 1971, but at all other levels women have lost ground.

Table 5. Women as a Percentage of Faculty Members in Four-Year Colleges and Universities

	1959-60	1965-66	1971-72
All ranks	19.1	18.4	19.0
Professor	9.9	8.7	8.6
Associate Professor	17.5	15.1	14.6
Assistant Professor	21.7	19.4	20.7
Instructor	29.3	32.5	39.4

Source: National Education Association 1972 p.13
The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education p.277

On the average, women who hold the same degrees as men have been hired one rank lower. Astin and Bayer, in a regression analysis, conclude that:

> If the same criteria, with the same weights, were applied in awarding rank to women as are applied to men, the average compensatory increase in rank would be from slightly below to somewhat above the Assistant Professor level, an average of one-fifth step. [15]

Women are particularly inclined to be given marginal appointments (part-time, non-ladder jobs with built-in disadvantages: very low salaries, lack of fringe benefits, no access to tenure, etc.)

Part of the penalty process is marriage, as illustrated by Astin and Bayer:

> For women, advancement is facilitated by being single or divorced (though divorce is less significant than not having married. Women advance up the ranks best if they.......have fewer children or remain single. [16]

Promotion. Those women who do progress through the ranks do so at a significantly slower rate than men. Robinson states that:

> Every institutional analysis of promotion that examined length of time in rank showed that women progress through the ranks at a significantly slower rate than men.[17]

In addition, The Carnegie Commission report cited the Astin-Bayer and Scott reports to show that:

> In virtually all public institutions and in many private institutions that have formal salary structures, the discrimination does not take the form of paying a woman a lower salary than a man when she is in the same step of the same rank, but it does take the form of not moving her up through the steps and ranks as quickly.[18]

The Carnegie report asks:

> How does this discrimination come about? It is doubtful that it results from deliberate decisions of college and university administrators to discriminate against women, but rather from myriads of individual decisions within departments and schools that do the actual recruitment and selection of faculty members (subject to subsequent administration approval) and that initiate the recommendation for increases and promotion.[19]

Salaries. The table below shows the national variation in salary by sex within rank at four-year private institutions to be from $568 for Instructors to $2,468 at the Professorial level. In an admittedly "extremely conservative" estimate of the extent of sex discrimination in academe, Astin & Bayer found, in regression analysis, that none of 26 variables analyzed, such as publishing, doctorate, years in academe, years at current institutions, and research, explained the degree of variance in salary differentials between men and women. In order to compensate women of equal rank, background, achievement and work setting, an average raise of more than $1,000 would be required by 1968-69 standards. An increase substantially beyond $1,000 would be required to redress the:

> amount of actual salary discrimination attributable to institutional discrimination, restricted opportunity and unequal advancement patterns.[20]

As Table 6 shows, at Universities men exceed the average salary, while women fall short by almost $4,000. This discrepancy is reflected consistently at every rank, where men exceed and women fall short of the average salary.

Table 6

Number and Average Salary of Full-Time Instructional Faculty on 9 - 10 Month Contracts in Institutions of Higher Education, by Level of Institution, Rank and Sex, 1972-73
Privately Controlled Institutions, Fifty States and D.C.

Rank and Sex	Total		Universities		Other 4-year		2-year	
	No. of Faculty	Average Salary	No. of Faculty	Average Salary	No. of Faculty	Average Salary	No. of Faculty	Average Salary
Total	75,008	$13,671	21,628	$16,132	48,392	$12,588	1,988	$ 9,523
Men	59,112	14,358	21,056	16,696	36,971	13,171	1,085	9,462
Women	15,896	11,114	3,572	12,310	11,421	10,703	903	9,596
Professors	19,340	18,351	8,448	21,493	10,679	16,334	213	10,174
Men	17,503	18,842	7,995	21,666	9,362	16,564	146	10,215
Women	1,837	15,570	453	18,441	1,317	14,862	67	10,085
Associate Professors	18,512	13,771	6,442	15,325	11,781	12,987	289	11,069
Men	15,334	14,040	5,614	15,493	9,530	13,242	190	11,109
Women	3,178	12,471	828	14,186	2,251	11,909	99	10,992
Assistant Professors	26,661	11,809	7,717	12,511	18,445	11,569	499	9,849
Men	20,243	12,179	6,254	12,621	13,696	12,029	293	9,793
Women	6,418	10,642	1,463	12,042	4,749	10,242	206	9,929
Instructors	10,495	9,268	2,021	10,127	7,487	9,102	987	8,765
Men	6,032	9,474	1,193	10,418	4,383	9,337	456	8,323
Women	4,463	8,988	828	9,709	3,104	8,769	531	9,145

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education. Preliminary data, February 1973.

Tenure. Nationally, about 50% of all faculty men but only 38% of all faculty women occupy tenured positions. 75% of tenured men achieved tenure in their forties. 55% of tenured women do not achieve tenure until they are in their fifties.[21]

Although marital status has nothing to do with the age at which men receive tenure, married women must usually wait longer than single women and many are in their sixties before tenure is granted. Once again, women are penalized for their marital role held in conjunction with academic roles, in contrast to men. And:

> once again, having children gives men an edge in the attainment of tenure, but penalizes women.[22]

Cronyism, using the "old boy network" to select candidates for academic appointments and promotion, discriminates against women in academe. It also tends to create feelings of frustration and isolation among women faculty members and to negate the concept of the University as a community of scholars.

Summary. Traditionally, the academic reward structure has been characterized by the variables of rank, salary and tenure, rather than the quality of teaching interest and ability. In order to reform the institution of higher education, further understanding of institutional barriers to women achieving the traditional rewards is required. But examination of the functions and dysfunctions of the existing reward structure is also required to improve the effects of the entire process on students as clients, faculty as personnel, and society as the ultimate recipient of the educational process.

Federal Guidelines for Affirmative Action

With the promulgation of Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 during the Johnson Administration, followed by Executive Order 11478 signed by President Nixon in 1969, and Revised Order #4 (part 60-2), it became illegal for federal contractors, including Universities, to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. Federal contractors were ordered to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated during employment without regard to these factors.[23]

As a preliminary to the development of a meaningful affirmative action program, the University is required to survey and analyze the situation which prevails at this institution. The following factors must be determined:

1) Is there any pattern of job classification and assignment identifiable by sex or minority group?

2) Is there any job classification or organizational unit where women or minorities are not employed or are under-utilized?*

3) Are there any patterns in rate of pay, status, type of appointment, termination or rates of advancement within job classification or organizational units which are identifiable by sex or minority group?

The F.D.U. Board of Trustees adopted the following Affirmative Action Policy Statement at a meeting on September 12, 1973:

> It is the policy and practice of Fairleigh Dickinson University to operate as an equal opportunity employer. We will insure that all personnel actions such as recruiting, hiring, promotion, compensation, benefits, transfers, layoffs, University sponsored training, education, tuition assistance, social and recreational programs will be administered on the basis of ability and potential without regard to race, creed, color, sex, religion, age, national origin, or marital status.

---

* Under-utilization is defined in the regulations as "having fewer women or minorities in a particular job than would reasonably be expected by their availability."

> We are and will continue to be responsive to the affirmative action guidelines established by Federal Executive Order 11246 and other related Federal and State statutes in carrying out this policy and practice.
>
> Our commitment to the maximum development and utilization of our human resources means that we are interpreting our affirmative action program thrust in the broadest possible sense. Our institutional goal is the insuring of an atmosphere in which all members of the University community can grow and develop to their fullest potential as human beings.

In a Newsletter (No. 76) of September 19, 1973, then President J. Osborn Fuller of F.D.U. announced the formation of a seven member Affirmative Action Steering Committee and charged it with the implementation of the University's affirmative action plan, as follows:

> As the phrase implies, affirmative action requires the University to make additional efforts to recruit, employ and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded. The premise of the affirmative action concept of the Executive Order is that unless positive action is undertaken to overcome the effects of systematic institutional forms of exclusion and discrimination, a benign neutrality in employment practice will tend to perpetuate the status quo ante indefinitely.
>
> The affirmative action concept does not require that our University employ or promote any persons who are unqualified. The concept does require, however, that any standards or criteria which have had the effect of excluding women and minorities be eliminated, unless the University can demonstrate that such criteria are conditions of successful performance in the particular position involved.

Purposes of Study

It was against this background of general societal concern for the status of women and the development of

an Affirmative Action Plan at this University that the Status of Women study was undertaken. Preliminary statistical data revealed a pattern similar to the national findings of differential salaries, rank and tenure for women, relative to male colleagues. While the percentage of women on faculties has been found to be smallest at the "elite institutions", it is of interest that at a four-year "non-elite" private university such as Fairleigh Dickinson, the percentage of women on faculty still does not exceed 20.5%.
Of a total of 488 faculty members in 1972-73, 100 were women. Table 7 shows the distribution by rank and sex of F.D.U. Faculty, 1972-1973.

Table 7

Distribution of Women and Men Full-Time Faculty, 1972-73 (In percentages)

	Men		Women		
	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	Total
Professor	84	21.6	9	9.0	93
Associate Professor	138	35.6	29	29.0	167
Assistant Professor	135	34.8	43	43.0	178
Instructor	31	8.0	19	19.0	50
Total	388	100.0	100	100.0	488

Total Faculty: 488; 79.5% Men; 20.5% Women.

Madison Campus

Professor	12	12.5	1	4.8	13
Associate Professor	38	39.6	7	33.3	45
Assistant Professor	35	36.5	9	42.9	44
Instructor	11	11.4	4	10.0	15
Total	96	100.0	21	100.0	117

Total Faculty: 117; 82.1% Men; 17.9% Women.

Rutherford Campus

Professor	13	14.6	2	5.7	15
Associate Professor	32	36.0	12	34.3	44
Assistant Professor	34	38.2	13	37.1	47
Instructor	10	11.2	8	22.9	18
Total	89	100.0	35	100.0	124

Total Faculty: 124; 71.8% Men; 28.2% Women.

Teaneck Campus

Professor	59	29.1	6	13.7	65
Associate Professor	68	33.5	10	22.7	78
Assistant Professor	66	32.5	21	47.7	87
Instructor	10	4.9	7	15.9	17
Total	203	100.0	44	100.0	247

Total Faculty: 247; 82.2% Men; 17.8% Women.

As is the pattern in most academic institutions, those women who remained are clustered in the lower ranks. Of the 100 total women faculty, the clustering at the bottom is even more glaring: 8.8% Professors; 28.4% Associate Professors; 43.1% Assistant Professors; and 19.6% Instructors. Of the 78 women interviewed 9.7% were Professors; 17.4% were Associate Professors; 24.6% were Assistant Professors and 39.2% were Instructors. As few women occupy the top rank as men occupy the bottom rank. No campus is exempt from discriminatory manifestation. Therefore, each campus may be examined separately to show that each one varyingly bears its burden of noncompliance with affirmative action. Each campus shows varying centers of gravity of discrimination, for example, Madison is worst in the representation of full Professors; Teaneck is worst in promoting women from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor; and Rutherford retains the highest proportion of women in the lowest rank of Instructor.

In order to probe beyond the surface statistics, however, it was necessary to develop qualitative methodologies which would enrich our understanding of the casual factors producing such distinctive patterns of under-utilization of women.

The underlying assumption of the study is that without deliberate intent, practices and procedures have arisen at every level of the University which militate in favor of men, and which have become institutionalized, largely without awareness of administrators, faculty or students. Although these practices may have originated unintentionally, it is inexcusable that they continue with the changes in law and increased consciousness of women's rights that have emerged. Through the use of interview data, observation and content analysis, the incremental decisions made at each level should become more visible. Only then can effective change be implemented.

The special objectives of the overall study were:

a. To determine the status of women relative to men among the faculty, professional staff, non-professional staff, undergraduate and graduate student population at F.D.U.

b. To obtain perceptions of differential behavior toward women within the University.

c. To make recommendations based on data collected to remove institutional barriers and seek positive supportive measures to improve the status of women at the University.

II. Delimitations

Phase 1 was restricted to an in-depth interview with full-time faculty women at all three campuses. The purpose of the interview was to discover how women faculty perceive their status today, at the

University and in the larger academic community. While the focus of this study is the woman faculty member, insights drawn from these interviews might be applicable in many respects to their male counterparts.

Future research might reveal, for example, that men faculty feel the same tension between opportunity for research and writing and the primary activity of teaching. But it is the objective of this study to reveal patterns hindering or aiding women at this institution. A latent consequence of discovering such patterns could be greater opportunity for men similarly situated as well.

Faculty perceptions will be compared to analysis of statistics for the entire population of men and women full-time faculty at the University.

III. Description of Procedures

Interview of full-time female faculty members was completed during the Spring semester 1973. Seventeen women served as volunteer interviewers after attending a training session in the objectives of the project, purpose of the interview technique and in the use of an interview guide devised for the purpose. In previous studies of other Universities, some of the factors found to contribute to salary, rank and tenure differentiation have been: doctorate, research and publication productivity, type of institution, number of years in teaching specialization, quality of one's graduate institution, career patterns, fellowship support, marital status and number of children. Therefore, the interview guide focussed on these areas. (See Appendix for Interview Guide)

IV. Sample Responding to Interview

78% of the total population of 100 full-time faculty women responded to the interview. Only 10 women directly refused to be interviewed. Of the remainder, 12% were inaccessible for a variety of reasons. The data are reported in general to preserve anonymity.

VI. Perceptions of Discrimination

Respondents were asked their perceptions of the relative freedom and opportunities of men and women in academia, in general, in their field of specialization, at other institutions, at F. D. U., as faculties, as trustees and administrators. Their responses were classified into five categories: (1) high degree of discrimination, in general and at F. D. U.; (2) substantial discrimination, in general and at F. D. U.; (3) moderate discrimination, some in general and at F. D. U.; (4) little discrimination, some in general, none or little at F.D.U.; (5) no discrimination, in general or at F. D. U. A summary of the perceptions of discrimination is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Perceptions of Discrimination Among Full-time Women Faculty at Fairleigh Dickinson University

	1	2	3	4	5
Madison	6%	11%	33%	28%	22%
Rutherford	15%	8%	27%	23%	27%
Teaneck	23%	9%	38%	21%	9%
Total University	17%	9%	33%	23%	18%

Table 8 also indicates the differences in perception among the campuses, with Teaneck having the highest proportion of high perceivers, Madison the smallest proportion of high perceivers, and Rutherford the highest proportion of low perceivers.

In an attempt to relate the perceptions of discrimination to the actual status of women at all three campuses, the median salary of full-time faculty 1972-73 were examined. (Average salary data were explained in Table 17, p. 98). The data show that a clear pattern of sex differentiation exists in relation to salary at all three campuses, ranging from $200 to $1600.* The largest differentiations between men and women are found in the Instructor and Associate Professor rank at Teaneck and Associate Professor ranks at all three campuses.

---

* The exceptions are in the ranks of Instructor and Assistant Professor at the Rutherford campus where women earn more than men in these ranks, and in the rank of Professor at Teaneck where there is no differential.

Table 9

Median Salaries of Full-Time Faculty, 1972-1973

	(1) Total Faculty	(2) Men	(3) Women	(4) Sex Differential $	(5) Sex Differential %
		University			
Professor	$22,300	$22,300	$21,700	-600	- 2.7
Associate	18,500	17,300	-1,200	- 6.5	
Assistant	14,900	14,900	14,100	-800	- 5.4
Instructor	12,100	12,200	12,000	-200	- 1.6
		Madison Campus			
Professor	21,900	22,100	21,000	-900	- 4.1
Associate	18,100	18,500	17,100	-1,400	- 7.6
Assistant	13,700	14,700	13,900	-800	- 5.4
Instructor	12,100	12,100	11,500	-600	- 5.0
		Rutherford Campus			
Professor	21,300	21,300	21,100	-200	- 0.9
Associate	18,500	18,700	17,500	-1,200	- 6.4
Assistant	14,600	14,500	15,200	+700	+ 4.8
Instructor	12,300	11,700	12,700	+1,000	+ 7.9
		Teaneck Campus			
Professor	22,100	22,100	22,100	0	-
Associate	18,500	18,900	17,300	-1,600	- 8.5
Assistant	14,900	15,100	14,100	-1,000	- 6.6
Instructor	12,000	12,700	11,100	-1,600	- 12.6

The high perceptions of discrimination of the Teaneck women more nearly resemble their actual status insofar as salary is concerned, compared to the Madison women, who do not perceive their actual status. The apparent similarity of the low perceptions of discrimination of Rutherford women and their actual salary status should be considered in light of another statistic. That is, the relative proportion of women in each rank at each campus show that a higher proportion of Rutherford women are maintained at the rank of Instructor, although given higher salaries. (See Table 7, p. 19).

Rank Correlated with Perceived Discrimination

When rank was compared with the perceptions of discriminations for the University, there was no clear correlation between the degree of discrimination perceived and rank, except at the level of Professor, where the highest percent perceived discrimination. However, the Professor rank split into two extremes:

half perceived strong discrimination, half perceived little or no discrimination.

Table 10. Rank Correlated with Perceived Discrimination

	high 1	2	3	4	low 5
Professor	50%	0%	0%	25%	25%
Assoc. Professor	18%	9%	27%	32%	14%
Asst. Professor	9%	11%	49%	14%	17%
Instructor	15%	8%	15%	31%	31%

In general, the lower ranks perceived the least amount of discrimination, with 62% of Instructors perceiving little or no discrimination, compared with 31% of Assistant Professors and 46% of Associate Professors.

This points up the fact that at lower institutional levels throughout the society, whether academic or general societal institutions, there is an absolutely smaller perception of disadvantaged position. In fact, in the case of this study lower ranks also imply restricted interaction and inability to perceive the full extent of disadvantage. This confirms the sociological finding that a broad range of interclass contacts is essential to perception of one's own class.[24] At the high end of the scale, 27% of Associate Professors, 23% of Instructors, and only 20% of Assistant Professors perceived substantial to high discrimination. The lack of correlation between actual rank and degree of perceived discrimination implies that they do not perceive their rank as evidence of sex discrimination. While it is difficult to generalize because of the small numbers, there is a tendency for higher ranked women to be more aware of the clustering of other women in the lower ranks.

Nor does tenure distinguish those who perceive a high degree of discrimination from those perceiving little or none. Tenured women are not more likely to perceive high discrimination when compared with their non-tenured colleagues.

Therefore, in order to understand the variation in perceptions of discrimination it is necessary to go beyond the traditional rewards of salary, rank, and tenure.

VII. Sex Awareness in Career Choices - Respondents were asked if they were aware of sex as a factor in selecting their major, graduate school and career choice.

In most cases those who perceived little or no discrimination also saw little or no sex awareness in their career, major or graduate school choices. They insisted they chose their field because of interest only. However, many of those who perceived little or no discrimination did indicate keen awareness of their sex in choosing women's schools; fields populated by women but led by men, (i.e., biology, chemistry, business administration or mathematics). This latter group, - women in largely male fields, pride themselves on having met the challenge of being "one of the boys". Those in the "female" professions felt cushioned from discrimination because of their majority.

On the other hand, the tendency of those perceiving sex awareness as a definite influence on their choice of careers, was to report a high degree of perceived discrimination in academe in general and at F.D.U. These women saw sex-segregated schools as discriminating against women since the female professions would seem to have lower status along with the women who populated these fields. The "male" professions were seen to have channeled women out, particularly from medicine and law, and forced them to settle for related fields such as biology, chemistry or the social sciences. Women in these professions who perceived high discrimination and high sex awareness cited difficulties women have in entering graduate school; male doubt of their seriousness and commitment to a career, and resentment by male graduate students of the exceptional female student; the "parcelling out" of doctorates to "women who don't need them as much as men".

> I was told 'You don't need a degree now. You're young. You have a job, a husband. You're relatively wealthy.'

Another group of women are those who perceived sex awareness with no discrimination because they are benefiting from the recent spurt of interest in recruiting women at higher levels. They are being encouraged and welcomed into professional schools and administrative roles elsewhere and they are planning to leave the University because they do not see comparable opportunities here.

An unexpected finding to the question testing perceptions of sex awareness in making career choices was the large number of women at a university such as Fairleigh Dickinson who had originally wanted to go into medicine. Some had progressed as far as pre-med undergraduate work; others had been discouraged at much earlier stages. These data help explain the differences in the percentages of women in the medical profession in countries such as the Soviet Union, where in 1963 75% of doctors were women compared to the United States where in 1965 only 6.7% of doctors were women. Cultural misperceptions keep women out of fields in which they flourish in other cultures. (Medicine is the area in which the greatest difference prevails between the United States and other countries[25])

Women in our sample also related having been turned away from chemistry, biochemistry, biology, international diplomacy, law and art. Those women who reported having been dissuaded from medicine, curiously enough, wound up in a variety of other fields such as chemistry, language English, social sciences, physical education, fine arts and biology. The reasons given for having been detoured included financial ones, such as "not feeling her parents should spend that kind of money for a girl". One woman who was interested in medical shcool said:

> There was no money available from the family. It was impossible to get a job to support herself, there were no scholarships for women in medicine and few women in that field. I would have had to get a job as a waitress and it wouldn't have covered the costs. I couldn't go out on the loading docks and earn enough money as my younger brother had, so I chose a curriculum at the undergraduate level which was open to both choices, pre-med and physical ed. I received the B.S. - the same as for the pre-med. I still feel I could go on to medicine and have even contemplated doing so. I would have to stop teaching, however, or I am perhaps too old.

Table 11 reveals the differences in perceptions of sex awareness among women at each campus.

Table 11. Perceptions of Sex Awareness in Career Choice Correlated with Degree of Perceived Discrimination, by Campus

	Univ.-wide (N-77) Perceived Discrim.*			Madison (N-17) Perceived Discrim.*			Rutherford (N-25) Perceived Discrim.*			Teaneck (N-34) Perceived Discrim.*			
	High %	Moder. %	Low %	High %	Moder. %	Low %	High %	Moder. %	Low %	High %	Moder. %	Low %	Total %
Sex wareness	19.5	15.6	19.5	11.8	11.8	17.6	24.0	16.0	32.0	20.6	14.7	11.8	54.6
o Sex wareness	5.2	18.2	22.1		23.5	35.3		12.0	16.0	11.8	20.6	20.6	45.4
Total esponses	24,7	33,8	41,6	11.8	35.3	52.9	24.0	28.0	48.0	32.4	38.2	32.4	100.0

* High = Categories 1 & 2
Mod-
erate= Category 3
Low = Categories 4 & 5

Categories 1 & 2 have been combined as high perceivers of discrimination, category 3 as moderate and categories 4 & 5 as low perceivers.

The majority of women in the sample (54.5%) showed sex awareness in selecting their major, graduate school, and career choice. However, the highest combined category (22%) were those who perceived little or no sex discrimination and no awareness of sex in making their career choices. The high perceivers rarely denied sex awareness in their choices (19.5%).

Madison women had the highest percentage of women contending no sex awareness (35%). Their perceptions of sex awareness meant being in a women's field. They were in their fields because of interest only. Rutherford women had a high percentage of sex awareness (72%) but a low perception of sex discrimination. The skewed distribution reflects the presence of the Nursing Department in Rutherford, which is an all-female department. The nurses are an extreme case of underperception of sex awareness. None of the Nursing respondents felt they had been channeled into a female profession, but they chose it knowing the bulk of nurses were women, but dominated by men at supervisory-executive levels (hospital administrators, directors of personnel and doctors). There is a high percentage of women at the rank of Instructor in the Nursing

Department. They pointed out the efforts to recruit men now, but "most men are married and have families and cannot afford to be nurses". This points up an irony: that the single most sex-typed occupation in the United States has made extended efforts to practice Affirmative Action.

The nurses who perceived their own income as supplementary denied that discrimination abounds. Nursing faculty tended to set stronger limitations on their involvement in professional associations than did other faculty women. One woman said, "If I wanted to be active, my voice was heard." Their passivity was notable, particularly in relation to the medical profession and its influential activities.

Another responded, "At state conferences, women are not as interested or as willing to give the time to attend or assume leadership." Again their passivity contrasts markedly with medical societies, another indication of subordination in the career line.

Many women at all three campuses discounted sex awareness but revealed in their interviews contradictory information.

Examples are:

> Sex was not a factor in my choice (but) there were only two women in graduate school class. There was often teasing from other students. My parents discouraged me from the field of International Diplomacy.

> My decisions were not affected by sex (but) I went to an all-girls' school, where there were no males in class.

Another woman in the English Department is traditional and sees English as a traditional women's field. She was not conscious then of the sex influence on her choice but now she is more aware of the possibility of subtle influences that might have prevailed because she is a female. This woman is an instance of how rising through the ranks heightens sex awareness.

In another case, a woman experienced discrimination against women in medical technology and therefore changed to language. She "personally never felt that language is a field favorable to women", but denied a sex influence. "Practicality alone influenced my choice of major," she declared. This is suggestive of the"unconscious altering and falsification of memories"that spare individuals from the painfulness of lost aspirations.[26]

Many women who perceived no sex awareness in their choice of major or career did experience their first discrimination as women at the graduate school level. Two women were advised that the way to succeed in graduate school was to sleep with a professor.

Another concluded that a "sugar daddy" in graduate school helps for research and publication. One psychologist stated that few women were in graduate school in her field, for women were not accepted as easily. Other women in male-dominated fields chose them because they felt that they were more prestigious than similar female-dominated fields. One biologist said sex had nothing to do with her choice but "being a woman I selected a school where I could work part-time".

Summary of Sex Awareness

The responses to this question were particularly interesting in terms of the lack of awareness many women revealed and the contradictions in their statements giving the reasons for their choices of major, career and graduate school. There was little or no indication of encouragement by professors in graduate school to help break free of societal expectations. Thus, a pattern of linked discrimination emerges, from graduate school through career.

Accommodating careers with marriage and family influenced many of the choices women faculty made. These decisions ranged from choosing the closest graduate school to accepting part-time status as student or faculty member while their children were young. Few married women were aware of the differences in career-home burdens between themselves and their male colleagues and between them and their husbands. In fact, a feeling of gratitude comes through from many who felt proud that they had been able to achieve University faculty status at all.

Recommendations:

1. F. D. U. must recognize the damaging effects on women of the attempt to discount sex awareness as a factor. Not only is denial of sex discrimination unfair and wasteful of human resources, it is now illegal.

2. Increase numbers of women faculty at all levels to serve as role models for students to stop channeling them into female areas and to give visible alternative life sequences.

3. Engage men and women faculty in dialogue about women's status, and about the status of men (there are male "marginals" who might become female allies).

4. The University should extend resources and facilities to a women's caucus to dispel pluralistic ignorance and raise women's consciousness of institutional barriers to success, and to put an end to women's blaming themselves for having fallen short of marks set by men, who have not had the home-career conflicts women have experienced.

VIII. Marital Status

In searching for the various factors that might account for perceptions of women at F.D.U., the question of marital status produced some of the most compelling insights into the difficulties facing professional women in American society today. Interview data are clear and conclusive on this point. Whether women perceived virtually no sex discrimination at this University or whether they have experienced the most extreme forms of attempted termination and denial of promotion, salary and tenure, there are universals that emerge beyond question.

Academic women here are striving mightily to cope with the demands of home and career, There are those who place their responsibilities for being a wife and mother first, but are determined to fulfill their career commitments without skimping in fulfilling their roles at home. At no point are women made to feel that they have as much right to their career as obligation to their husbands. They treat their right to a career as though it were a privilege given to them by "special dispensation". Once women have children, it is expected by most people that the woman will become home-centered to the exclusion of any significant capacity to function in their careers.

The case studies of women with interrupted career patterns reveal examples of note. One example is a pattern that appears to accompany low-status women at the University; it often ends in termination and is as follows:

> "I had had six children, 3 aging adults, in addition to my husband and myself to care for. I had no outside help. At the same time I was pursuing graduate studies and working part-time in order to pay tuition for graduate work. I finally attained a part-time position at the University and after ...years moved into full-time status as an Instructor."

This Instructor has since left the University's employ for a neighboring college because progress toward the doctorate proved too slow to avert a terminal contract. Despite this obstacle course, her attitude was:

> "I, like most women, have been meticulous about meeting career responsibilities. I'm not late for classes. Women feel they have to perform extra-well to measure up."

This exemplifies the extent to which women are reluctant to view themselves as possessing any right to family income to educate themselves toward professional goals. It also illustrates the tension under which they perform, conscious that they are women but so unconscious of their handicaps in being women.

In another example, one woman stated that women should accept less money for the privilege of being able to leave when the home demanded her. In answer to a question about maternity leave, she replied, "I usually have my babies in the summer. Women who want equality should ask for no special favors." While this pattern of planning pregnancies around vacation periods seems prevalent, no other women embraced the role of childbearer with quite as much alacrity!

A more common reaction to the home/career conflict was the recognition of the choice between the pressures of work leading to marital tension or the stultification of being confined to the home. While it was admitted that there was insufficient time to do research and attempt publication because of the additional home/mother role requirements, most women accepted this as a personal burden, not discrimination against females which is built into the system.

One such woman who sees no sex discrimination in general, or at this University, stated that "women must carry their full share of the load and prove their performance regardless of sex." This ignores the seventeen years she spent rearing her family and the inhibitions of professional growth undoubtedly created by the lack of full-time devotion to career during those years. She prides herself on her persistence and lack of the fear of failure, without recognizing that by delaying her career, she avoided the conflict to which her peers are subject.

Marital status was responsible for many home and/or career crises. Many women were turned down by graduate schools because of being married and having a child. Other women stopped graduate school when they married. A psychologist reported A-level graduate students for whom graduate studies have resulted in divorce. Some husbands actively discouraged wives from pursuing graduate study. One husband said, "I won't give you any money for it." This woman had taught piano in the past, and she resumed giving lessons to pay her tuition.

Women without perceived home/career conflicts were notably in the minority. These noted their husbands' active support and encouragement, which was perhaps the instrumental factor in avoiding the perception of such conflict.

But there were many ways in which women were penalized for their married status. This was, in two instances, at the hiring interviews and in salary negotiating committees. This latter arose in the statement to a woman that they suspected her of not fighting hard enough for salary increases because, they felt, she was married and could depend on her husband's income. Another woman complained that the male dean who interviewed her told her that, "he didn't want a married woman because she might not be responsible enough; she would have a commitment to her family." Yet later in the interview, when asked about personal experiences of sex discrimination, this woman who has been here seven years and achieved tenured status, said, "I am aware that women's salaries are lower than men's in academia and that men are preferred in hiring, but, I never personally experienced prejudice."

The most common male reaction to marital status was to regard the wife's career as a second income. Whether at hiring, in relation to promotion, or the granting of a doctorate, women quoted statements from male superiors, such as, "You don't need a degree now. You're young. You have a job and a husband and that keeps you relatively wealthy."

In this same case, a Placement Director was no help in finding a job. He stated, "You have a husband so you won't starve." Another respondent who had similar experiences noted, "Im tired of the repeated references to'what do you need the money for' or ' look at her big car and her fur coat.'"

The marital status of men is never discussed in the same terms. In fact, marital status is considered an advantage to a man when he is hired. The job stability attributed to men by virtue of their married status, is reversed for women who are married. For women, marriage and job instability are perceived as synonymous.

Single women complain of a different kind of discrimination. The expectation of them is that, since they do not have a husband and children, they should be available for additional registration duties and difficult schedules. Many of the respondents saw young single women as the most discriminated against since their image was one of unreliability. If they were not married, they were presumed to be looking for a husband. Or they were seen as sex objects. If they had not yet had children, they were assumed to be likely to become pregnant.

Marital status clearly elicits differential treatment of women. Married women are expected to be mobile if their husbands relocate. Married women are not seen by their superiors as the bread winners of their families and can therefore be treated thoughtlessly without the sense of personal responsibility that often results in the retention of marginal men.

Another common syndrome was that of married women whose careers were delayed - (in one case, as much as thirty years) and who lost their husbands because of their careers. As one woman put it,

> I'm a professional in spite of everything put in my path. I carried everything; house children and school. My marriage began to fall apart when I started to pursue a Ph.D. The marriage probably would have survived if I had been content to operate at a lower educational level.

She says that she is not bitter - just determined. She feels her situation in pursuing a career is normal for many women.

Several women on terminal contracts have felt extreme discrimination from their departments for having taken maternity leaves.*

In one case, a leave for maternity was followed by a terminal contract. The woman declined to take her case to the Grievance Committee again, even though she had appealed her case on the same problem the previous year and had won. She felt the source of her problem was her chairman's lack of sympathy toward married women in academe, and that it would generate further hostility if she won and stayed on. She feels she can find a much more interesting part-time position. She, as with so many women, has obviously not weighed the damage inherent in removing herself from a full-time tenure-career track.

The fear and weariness of fighting these battles runs throughout many of the interviews.

What the feminists refer to as the "super-woman", (women who overcame all societal and institutional barriers and won, and who carry home-career burdens throughout) is found at F.D.U. At lease 8 women still employed have been given terminal contracts at some point in their careers at F.D.U. and won. How many were unsuccessful in fighting non-renewal and terminal contracts and have left the University is impossible to determine.

---

* Conditions under which such leaves are accorded will be discussed under University Policies.

Those who decided not to fight can be viewed as retreatists, who in the face of unfavorable evaluations chose to withdraw from the fray. Oftentimes those are the greatest victims of oppression. As Paolo Freire declared the point of oppression is most perfect when the oppressed deny they are oppressed.

There is a prevalence of "pluralistic ignorance" among the women faculty at F.D.U. They are largely operating in a vacuum, unaware of their personal status as related to those about them, either men or women, in other departments. Frequently they pride themselves on their single-minded devotion to home and teaching their own classes.

Whether single or married, there is no question in the minds of the women interviewed that the house is the woman's responsibility. This is not a new discovery, since one faculty woman quoted the first woman chairman at Columbia as stating that women could do a lot more in the academic world, "if only they had wives! Men were definitely seen as more free to pursue their careers. In the case of a home/career conflict, there was no question that it was legitimate for a man's job to interfere with his family, because his role is to support the family for status and monetary gain. The women, on the other hand, felt guilty about such practices as "farming out" children in camp because of having to work for the summer. Despite this dual burden, women felt that if a woman can handle a career and family, her career is more valuable to the family than a stifled stay-at-home wife.

Studies have shown married men to be the most productive, among the correlation between sex, marital status and productivity. Why women have difficulty finding time for research and writing is easily understood when the pattern of home responsibility is examined in depth. Another manifestation of difficulty for married women with children, especially divorced women, who have the total problem of coping with family living and working it into their profession, is the lack of recognition of the dual responsibility of women. Supports are rarely provided by the institution for married women with children. This is particularly hard on divorced women, who are single heads of families. For example, one woman requested babysitting fees as part of her faculty grant-in-aid. This was rejected and she was unable to pursue a project that had otherwise been approved. Another woman would like work time off to do research because personal commitments at home prevent considering it now. Yet, many of our faculty women felt grateful for the opportunity to be full-time professional women. The answer does not lie in childlessness, since married women who have no children are considered deviant, and are sanctioned accordingly.

Summary of Marital Status

Women of every status perceived marital status to be a factor in sex discrimination. Whether single or married, women have the responsibility for the home. Where there are older handicapped relations, women have assumed the major responsibility for them. Yet most women perceived that women are more conscientious professionally and that they are eager to prove that they are performing on the same level as their male colleagues. They are on the defensive from the moment they are interviewed for a possible position. They spend their careers proving they can. handle both roles competently, conforming to a "superwoman" image.

Recommendations

1. The University must promulgate the directive that it is inimical to University policy to have considerations enter into the hiring of any person, which at all pertain to sex, marital status or the number of children.

The University should direct that this is information not required on vitae nor has it any right to be raised in any communication, verbal or written in the course of the hiring process, until after a final decision is made. The directive should also include that sex, marital status and number of children must not enter into determination of contract continuation, work performance, eligibility for tenure or sabbaticals.

2. There should be institutionalized flexibility to encourage young married women in the fulfillment of home-career commitments. Reduced loads should be provided after the birth of children if they are desired. These should be true pro-rated, part-time full status positions with proportionate shares of responsibilities to department and college, with commensurate benefits and salary.

3. At the option of the individual, a "stretch-out" of the pre-tenure period should be available.

4. Recognition of the difficulties, particularly for married women with young children meeting career commitments,would include the establishment of child-care facilities on campus for pre-school children. Many colleges have inaugurated such facilities. Such a facility could afford the College of Education a laboratory for early childhood development, and give

Psychology an opportunity for observing early life development. Child-care would enable (a) some students to continue their education, (b) some women to return to full-time status, (c) attract minority women, (d) provide quality education for children of all constituencies within the University. One neighboring school, Ramapo College, has established such a center, staffed by professionals, for the children of its students, faculty and staff.

IX Preferred Activities

Respondents were asked to compare their actual time allotment with their preferred time allotment in the following areas: teaching, counselling, research, etc. Women faculty members are, for the most part, well-satisfied with the apportioning of their time. Their first love is teaching, closely followed by counselling and advising students. Their major perceived problem is finding time to do research and writing, for which many would welcome the opportunity.

Most women perceived free choice in spending more time than men at student counselling and advising, and less at committee work, but a substantial number see this disproportion as the result of patterns of sex discrimination. Women generally felt that men are more involved in certain committees, often to the detriment of student-faculty relations. The men were seen as electing themselves to the most important committee positions where actual departmental, college or university power is wielded, and filling the remaining slots with enough women to look respectable. Women would be appointed as secretaries to committees, an occasional chairwoman of an important educational policy committee, or a lone member of a faculty status or grievance committee.

It is problematic whether the average woman has come to accept this underutilization of women on committees because she basically does not value the activity or because she has rarely been asked to contribute her efforts to a prestigious committee. Many who have served complain that their efforts were not productive, either because men undervalued women's contributions or because the administration did not act on recommendations made by faculty committees. The difficulty is that, free choice or not, committee service is necessary for evaluation as a faculty person worthy of rewards of promotion, tenure or continuing appointment, and women often misperceive this because models of other women are absent.

One woman, for example, said she preferred academic duties to administrative. "The latter are too much like taking care of a house! Men expect to rise through administrative jobs, money and power."

In several departments men were perceived not to enjoy scholarly work and not to produce much research. One woman faculty member has done some research and would like to do more research and writing but her department thinks this is trivial and unnecessary.

A few women have led important committees but at each campus these represented a handful of women. Those have become overburdened and are seeking to reduce commitment.

A respondent who is a specialist in her area devotes approximately 50 hours a week to teaching and specialized activity while she stated department men do no extra work beyond teaching.

Another women is devoting more time to committee work and less to teaching and writing than she would prefer. She thinks it is the same, however, for most male colleagues, but, "a bunch of them spend little time teaching and much time on committees; they would prefer being administrators. They are interested in the politicking of the University rather than subject matter."

There are on the faculty, some women who have high self images and yet are able to perceive a high degree of discrimination based on sex. However, they feel that they have sufficient stature to be operating as free agents and spending their time as they prefer. Their interactions have made them conscious of the disadvantaged status of their sex, both through their own struggles and by seeing the struggles of other women.

Younger scholars who are high perceivers are cognizant of the difficulties and possible solutions as summarized by one:

> I prefer three courses when advanced courses are taught. The fourth course could involve independent students. I spend a great deal of time in intense preparation for my courses and critiques of students' work and keeping up with the field. Barriers to women in research are lack of university facilities, time consumed in meetings and not being involved in administrative tasks the way men are.

She feels that most men are not conscientious and bases this on student complaints that they cannot find their male advisers. "Being available doubly penalizes you. The University should give full credit for these duties in lieu of research and writing."

The tremendous concern women show for students conflicts with their personal professional growth. Ironically, one university has emphasized the importance of student-faculty contacts, but at the same time gives no recognition to the time necessary to initiate and maintain this contact.

In terms of responsibility for attending faculty meetings, one woman noted that, increasingly, men don't show up for University faculty meetings or professional society meetings and yet they get promoted. Again, irresponsibility is rewarded.

Women with small children find that time for research and writing is very difficult since they have to make the extra time after the children go to sleep. Even women who were low perceivers of discrimination note that men do not have to take care of the house, laundry, etc. Those women who returned to the University full-time after raising their children point up the limitations to their careers because of the minimal time available for research and writing available during those years, which for men are the most productive years.

Most women who perceived low discrimination generally also did not attribute their allotment of time to sex discrimination. They were unable to see that societal and institutional expectations produced a clear pattern in which women generally had less opportunity to do research and write, gave most time to teaching and advisement and least time to committee service.

Several women had been urged to become more active on committees because of their lack of visibility to the dean, while at the same time being urged to pursue research. Unfortunately, several of these women received terminal contracts despite their strenuous effort to rectify their "deficiencies". One of these low-perceivers said that men have more time for research based on rank, not on sex. She felt that a male chairman was elected in her department, "not because of sex but because of his Ph.D. The only woman Ph.D. did not want it." At the time of the interview this woman was up for tenure and promotion and fully expected she would be evaluated not on sex, but on merit. Needless to say, she was devastated with the termination.

Summary of "Preferred Activities" Responses

Most women reported intensive preparation for their classes and spending a great deal of time correcting papers. Although their commitment to teaching is primary, and they meet their obligations of advisement willingly, realizing its importance to the total schooling experience, this emphasis places them in the position of finding research and writing difficult. Men are seen as taking more teaching assignments at other schools or at summer schools in order to make more money.

Those women who perceived political discrimination rarely attribute this to sex discrimination, an interesting misperception of cultural conditioning. Women are expected not to want to participate in political activities to the same degree men do.

Therefore, if committee work and administrative positions and leadership in policy making are seen as politically oriented, women are perceived as being less interested. Getting women active on committees will undoubtedly prove a key factor in eliminating stubborn residual forms of discrimination.

Recommendations for Faculty Activities

1) Increased stress should be placed on student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, the criterion which men and women faculty favor, according to national findings.[27]

2) Mechanisms should be developed to create part-time full status faculty positions for men and women for reasons of research, family or partial retirement. Shared full-time positions or pro-rated part-time positions with commensurate fringe benefits and time toward tenure are being advanced currently. This would also benefit men who are completing degree requirements, and/or who are attempting to equalize home-career burdens between themselves and their wives.

3) Women faculty members should be encouraged to chair departments, participate in departmental committees fully, and draw upon University resources to help them procure research and publishing opportunities. The F.D.U. Press might be particularly helpful in soliciting manuscripts and assisting women to publish. A "women scholars"

program at the F.D.U. Press might be undertaken. Also editors might be invited to campus to talk with women about manuscript preparation.

4) An ongoing Women's Caucus should alert women to expand their interests into areas of administration, research, publishing, with a long-range goal of the presence of women proportionate to their numbers in every aspect of university life.

X Departmental Differentiation

When asked their perceptions of sex differentiation relative to male colleagues in departmental areas, women tended to state categorically that there was no sex discrimination. However, 2/3 of the women reported one or another example of differential treatment despite their lack of identification of such treatment as discriminatory. Examples of such discrepancies include:

> I have a heavier load of advisees but this is based on rank, not sex.

Another example:

> In nine years only twice have I had thesis advisement, no honors mentors and no independent studies students....but this is not sex discrimination.

An interviewer noted:

> As I read off this list of possible areas of discrimination, she shook her head and said, 'None, None, None--no discrimination.' She said, 'there is absolute equality within this section. Because I was chairman, you can see there was no discrimination in the department.'

Another woman in that same department also perceived no sex discrimination in the department, despite the fact that she had received terminal contracts twice and was in the process of fighting again. These two women are in a department in which women constituted one-fifth of the faculty.

Even in a department of more equal proportions a similar discrepancy exists:

> The chairman is arbitrary in scheduling. I was a little peeved but I wasn't consulted on the schedule. It was simply handed out. However, this is not a sex thing. I'm afraid of night classes. Its dark out there and your car is way out. He doesn't seem to care how far you have to travel.

There were several items that women were pretty much agreed upon as being discriminatory in favor of men. One was that women get less secretarial assistance. Most women felt that they do more preliminary typing themselves. Men rely on the department secretary. This is an example of the extent to which women conform to the roles expected of them generally in the larger society. Women are expected to know how to type even though nowhere in academic qualifications are such skills given credit.

The second perceived discrimination was that women were seen to have less equipment and office space than men, particularly in departments that were not heavily male-dominated. In such departments, there was not so much difference between and women as that the entire department was crowded. One woman in such a department complained that she was the only full-time faculty member asked to share a desk with a part-timer. Several women said they were, "insulted by the office space", that there was so little office space it was ridiculous. There were perceived differences in some departments where senior men had more space and only the chairman and ex-chairman were allowed to use the secretary.

Those colleges for which space was considerably more elegant and adequate invariably were those in which there were virtually no women, such as business administration and dentistry. One woman who had had secretarial assistance, which was not replaced because of economic factors, said she was expected to do all the writing and public relations in connection with high schools throughout the state. Her space allocation was impossible for record-keeping and visitors.

Several women who had taken on additional responsibilities for new programs or special University programs noted that they had finally received their first file cabinet. Even these women reported, however, that they had inadequate office space and insufficient secretarial help despite their extra University service.

Other areas of sex discrimination noted included teaching schedules and the load of advisees. Some attributed it to the fact that women were in the lowest ranks and therefore got the poorest schedules. In preference to the hectic two-day schedule, one woman felt constrained to be available all week, but her primary choice, the three-day schedule, was given to a male senior colleague. This she attributed to politics and rank, not sex. She did point out, however, that no women were in the "power group" in the department, i.e. those who made policy and actively engaged in intra-departmental politics.

Another important aspect of departmental discrimination was that of the exploitation of part-timers. Some departments prefer the Teaneck housewife, but the part-time route, although a popular one for married women with children, appears associated with extremely low salary offers when they become full-time.

Some women complained of teaching only service courses which channeled women out of research in their fields. In one case, a woman achieved considerable distinction in teaching other teachers in her field. She prefers teaching and has obviously been very successful in achieving national recognition for her model institute, but in her department the men are research-oriented and undervalue her specialty.

Her efforts are praised by University administrators, yet she has remained 9 years as an Assistant Professor and was recently denied promotion. The staff men on her project hold higher ranks than she, and an equivalent project earned full Professor rank for a male colleague at another institution.

Many women complained of spending more time at registration than men. The chairman was seen to consult faculty friends first in scheduling such advisement.

Most women saw themselves doing more routine advisement and counselling of students. The situation was reversed, however, when the honors mentorships, supervision of independent study, graduate advisement, or thesis advisement were considered prestigious to the department. In some departments no graduate courses were assigned under Associate Professor ranks and since fewer women were at that rank in those departments they were deprived of the opportunity of working with graduate students. Women stated they would like more advanced classes and graduate students, but they don't even know the selection process, even when they have in the past been involved in giving thesis advisement. It is a mystery why they haven't been asked again. Women have described past remuneration for honors students, and other special students, and for substitution teaching. When these duties were paid, it was political, i.e., a case of knowing the right person. Now that there is no extra pay attached, women are beginning to get an equal share of the prestigious students.

There were exceptions to this pattern, as in the college of education where women had a heavier load on the doctoral level and some felt they were given the students with grievances to "cool off". One woman in the college of education who had a much higher load of advisees than her male colleagues said women were more willing to devote time and were more competent to do this.

One woman who would like to spend more time writing said there is no help for professional individual work and there is no decent typewriter in the office, therefore compelling her to work at home.

> Women are always asked to do substitute teaching and even substitute secretarial work. I never remember seeing a man do secretarial work.

Similarly, dentists expect dental hygienists to do overload secretarial work, another example of sex-role stereotyping.

While a woman heads one campus honors program, she has one desk in a room with four other people, which is extremely inadequate. She shares a departmental secretary with 23 others and a secretary for 5 hours a week for the honors program. Because of this special assignment she has a filing cabinet. In several cases, grants, supplements and twelve month contracts for administrative duties also masked low salaries for their rank and years in service when compared with other men and women on ten month contracts.

Women generally perceived that they were more interested and willing than men to help students outside of the classroom with academic and personal advisement. Some of the reasons were:

> Women were more approachable; men were less available to students; men were not pulling their weight.
>
> In our department it's a disaster.
>
> I'm directing the only graduate program - it's hellish but I'm to blame - counselling and independent study are also higher as a result.
>
> Students seek me out. Many men don't particularly like students.
>
> Men don't do as much informal counselling.

In several fields, the women were specialists and no one could substitute for them. One exception appeared to be in the department of physical education, in which women did most of the teaching because men have the coaching responsibilities. Some of these women felt that the men are as good at counselling, which evolves out of their coaching. The differences between men and women in this department are interesting.

> The bulk of committee work has fallen on women because men feel the women have more time.
>
> The budget for physical equipment is less.
>
> Men spend a fortune on uniforms but that's because they bring in money from their atheletic events. Women have no scholarships. There is no recruiting of women for sports. There is a great deal of discrimination.
>
> Men get greater use of the gym. Female students have not demanded the use or turned out for sports as much.

This called to mind the kind of sex discrimination lawsuit that recently was filed in Pochelle Park, New Jersey in which it was pointed out that the principal of a K to 8 school said $2,100 is spent for boys' sports compared to $700 for girls' sports.[28]

Informal discrimination was reported by several women, consisting of: men consulting with one another, talking departmental politics, getting new ideas, seeing the chairman regarding raises or changed assingments. Another example of the kind of loneliness that women often experience in male-dominated departments is that of a young woman who does not feel she has been well treated in her department. She has had no interesting upper-level courses to teach while a young man who has the same qualifications with one year less experience has been given one upper-level course. She finds that she "waivers between paranoia and going right out and accusing others of sex discrimination." She feels that there is an inability to take her seriously in spite of her qualifications. The interviewer's comments in this case were that,

> She was young and attractive. Although she is not raising a family and cannot be accused of putting home before career she is being treated as if she were teaching as a hobby.

The respondent was seen as experiencing the sort of frustrations that often occur when one is at the bottom of a hierarchy and not sure why. Uncertainty of her situation was in part based on the repeated one year contract she was given which made her ineligible for a specific grant she had wished to apply for, as well as making her feel so temporary that it was difficult to feel at home. She feels that she is a good teacher, has tried other fields and concluded that teaching is what she does best. In her department there has been a lot of illness among women and others have been let go. She equates the unhealthful psychological climate with her personal insecurity. At this point, she is on a terminal contract.

A woman faculty member complained of never being treated as a colleague. Despite the fact, this woman has achieved outstanding success in her specialty, one in which there are extremely few women. She comments,

> Professionally, it's easier to be a man than a woman. No one knows what a woman has to forget in order to pursue her career and not become paranoid. As Dr. Samuel Johnson said, 'A woman teaching is like a dog standing on his hind legs, you don't expect him to do it well. The wonder is that he can do it at all.'

In comparing the campus reactions to departmental differentiation, both Teaneck and Madison had approximately 2/3 of their respondents report one or another form of differential treatment while at Rutherford less than half of the women reported such examples. This can again be attributed at least in part to the Nursing Department's location at Rutherford in which there are no males to provide contrast in treatment of faculty by sex. In content, the forms of discrimination did not vary from campus to campus as reported above.

Summary of "Departmental Differentiation" Responses

In general, women reported equal class and teaching schedules, except where differences were attributed to political favoritism usually by men chairmen to other senior men faculty.

In terms of advisement, women definitely perceived a greater load, at least in part because of unavailability of men who were perceived to leave the campus as quickly as possible, often for other remunerated activities. Where activities such as honors mentorships, independent supervision, thesis advisement, and graduate advisement were either reimbursed or seen as prestigious to the department, women felt a lack of access to such "plums". Where these tasks were perceived to have had the prestige removed, as when reimbursement was eliminated, women now reported equal access to such tasks.

In terms of departmental committee work, some departments apparently operate politically, relegating women's participation to unimportant committees, such as planning Christmas parties, collecting money for gifts and serving coffee. On the whole, women seemed more willing to participate in committee work than they were given the opportunity to do.

Office space, secretarial assistance and equipment appeared to be associated with the prestige of the department which is a correlation of the percentage of male faculty. The worst problems of space, secretarial availability and equipment were reported by small departments in which there were higher than the general percentage of women, such as English, Sociology, Language and Fine Arts.

In most cases in which there had been or currently were women department heads, a reduction in the inequities in scheduling and salaries was felt to be accomplished. Men were seen to have greater opportunity to become department heads, and they in turn to favor men in scheduling and course assignment.

Recommendations for Departmental Assignments

1. Women should be selected as department heads and to chair important departmental committees, in increasing numbers.

2. Deans should instruct that teaching schedules rotate, irrespective of rank, among all department members, so that the least and the most desirable time slots be available in a more just distribution to all colleagues.

3. Men faculty should be required to be equally available for more intensive student-faculty interaction and a stronger advisement program.

4. Office space should be appropriate to teaching, consultation and research requirements, established by universalistic criteria.

5. All secretaries must be available to all faculty for help in preparing tests, articles and reports.

6. Honors mentorships, independent students and thesis advisement should be rotated among faculty, with the option to decline.

XI. College and University Committee Service

Respondents were asked their perceptions of sex discrimination in the appointment or election of women to college and university committees. Almost all of the interviewees had some perception of discrimination in this area. At the low end of the spectrum they attributed the small proportion of women on college and university committees to their small proportion on the faculty. Some cited the discrimination of women against other women who were perceived as "ambitious".

One woman felt that women are utilized according to their talents, yet acknowledged that men have asked for her opinion in a teasing way as related to her "maternal instincts". She found this complimentary. Another at the low spectrum of perceived discrimination felt that women's contributions are equally wanted, that expertise determines your contribution and that women are less visible but not excluded." She was unsure is that was sex discrimination. Another low perceiver of discrimination noted that women are on a lot of college and departmental committees. It seemed a fair proportion to her. As she began to cite the specific committees women were on she became more unsure and ended with, "perhaps I need consciousness raising!"

On the whole, however, women at all three campuses noted that men were definitely elected or appointed 9 out of 10 times to committee positions. Almost every woman noted that women were primarily secretaries to committees. The powerful committees elected men even if they were less experienced than the women eligible for that committee. Women were noted to be chairmen of minor committees while the men were chairmen of the major ones.

One moderate admitted that,

> "We do have some male chauvinists on campus but they are not the majority of men. The results are well established before the ballots go out, although recently there have been more open ballots."

To men, women are seen as supportive rather than primary participants on committees. Reasons for this disproportion included:

> Men vote against women because they don't trust their ability to be logical; they see them as emotional.
>
> The dean strikes me s a male chauvinist, frightened of aggressive women. He is not bringing women in. The dean fixes elections to get his man in. Only one woman is the exception.
>
> Women are not as good at abstract thinking as men, said the chairman of this woman's department.

One woman has heard, "That's not a bad idea....for a woman." Some women explained their reluctance to volunteer for committees - because they resented never being promoted beyond Instructor. One recalled:

> As the chairperson, men were not willing to go along with my suggestions. I resent their attributing my success to female intuition. I have been blackballed from committees because I am not one of the boys. I can't invite a male colleague to lunch or cocktails whereas men can solve problems in a social context.

In terms of their personal experience, it ranged from women who noted they had run for many posts and had rarely been elected, to those who felt they were overworked and overburdened by a continual request to serve. Some committees, such as the Faculty Status Committee, Grievance Committee and Senate require women with more years of service than women have been able to acquire at F.D.U.* It was noted that there were no women on the recent tri-campus salary committee.

One woman who has often been passed over in the past for departmental committees for which she would be the logical choice, felt that formerly those close to the President of the University got jobs. She questioned whether this was sex discrimination or political. Friends outside the department would put her name forth but she was not elected to any post. At the time of this interview, she had turned away from University activities as a result of past discrimination.

Several other feminist women also attributed the lack of election of women to their political views as being too radical for the basically conservative male faculty at this University. A group of male faculty were seen as becoming more ruthless toward women in the last 3 years or so. A woman who feels that the lack of women on committees is not sex-based attributes it to an "interlocking directorate" in which the same people are always elected.

---

* Only 48 respondents have been here 6 years or longer, with as few as 9 at Madison here that long.

Women urged that we have more women on college committees because they have much to offer. They are most responsible, show up consistently, are most intelligent and the least ego involved. An example cited was that of a search committee which chose the least threatening man although the women on the committee wanted a more aggressive man to shake things up. The penalty of such attitudes is the selection of administrators who are incapable of making needed change. The men were seen to outnumber and dominate the women on committees, promoting the lowest common denominator of "least threat".

When asked about the perceptions of male colleagues undervaluing women's contributions to committee deliberation, those women who have had considerable experience on committees generally felt that they are personally so confident and tenacious that they gain acceptance from their male colleagues. Each cited examples such as,

> I was told, 'My dear lady...' I interrupted, 'I am not a lady - which I hope to conclusively prove by the end of the meeting.'
>
> Younger women are not taken seriously. The older women here are seen as powerhouses.

A handful of women on all three campuses feel they have been taken seriously and have made substantial contributions to important committee work. They felt their views and opinions were received with proper consideration.

> Most responsible positions are difficult because they require an aggressive person and women prefer not to be aggressive.
>
> Women are too vocal to be undervalued.
>
> Few vocal women's opinions are respected and accepted. If women don't speak up they are looked down on.

On the question of whether women should be vocal or quiet, there seems to be no strong agreement. Some women feel that the vocal person is the one usually elected, whether male or female.

> Women are often heard out. I don't know why men go out of their way to listen!

Another saw women underplaying because they anticipate discrimination. Therefore they are undervalued. Another felt men are more verbose and she tends to be quiet, but in her opinion women make "thoughtful" contributions.

Some women, particularly those who have been around the University for many years, felt that men lean on women to do the work. They have almost always served as secretaries to their committees and as one said, "I just recently rejected the office. I've served my quota." Another woman said,

> The preference goes to a man every time. Women don't open their mouths.

She knew of women pushed aside for men. Friends lost out because men combine against women. Another stated,

> Female suggestions fall flat at meetings. Either women don't discuss or an argument occurs. Women tend to put themselves in a position of deference, accepting the inevitability of not expecting to make a major contribution.
>
> A certain attitude of men toward women on committees is not healthy. A woman senses an attitude, gets belligerent, the male reacts to this, not to the quality of the contribution. This unhealthy attitude is not confined to F.D.U., it is just because we grew up in this society.

Having observed women being sneered at at faculty meetings, one respondent said she is personally strong at committee meetings and won't be shut up.

> Men cannot dissociate from their traditional sex roles. Either there is a threat perception seen or they are exploitative.

One perceiver of high discrimination feels that,

> A woman has to be very outstanding or willing to kow-tow and be a stooge or brown-nose. The men get together and vote in blocks. Men flatter women as a child. There is an excessive concentration on sex and little regard for academic achievement or competence. I

> wish they'd stop looking at legs and look at minds.

One woman feels that it is not malicious - when men undervalue women they do not mean to put women down. A few women sound off without thinking it through. She has sometimes agreed with the men.

Others who, though in the definite minority, felt that women's contributions are not undervalued, cite themselves or other outstanding women who have been on prominent committees as examples. One old-timer questions how important what a woman says is:

> Men regard women as one step removed from reality. Some perception of change is occurring. Women are no longer being offered as secretaries. Nominating committees which were formerly blind to women have been somewhat broken. The administration is better at the appointment of women. Efforts are being made to give equal opportunity to women.

A new woman chairman of an important policy committee represents the first woman elected to such office on her campus. One man keeps needling her for being a female chairwoman.

> He needles me for female chauvinism - it's no problem though, others call me and praise the job I'm doing.

One other explanation women give for not wanting to serve on committees is their feeling that the administration pays no attention to outcome:

> They rarely act on any recommendation. The faculty lacks solidarity and is

> permanently frightened by one year contracts. Even tenured people feel frightened and academic standards are not being upgraded.

Summary of "College and University Service" Responses

A climate does not appear to exist at F.D.U. which encourages more women to offer themselves for elected office or to expect appointments to important committee posts. Some have adopted a retreatist philosophy after several years of attempting to serve on committees. Others feel overburdened as one of the token women on many committees and have decided to discontinue that role. It is in this area that the image of the female role has been most pertinent. As Cynthia Epstein notes:

> In American society the imputed feminine attributes include among others personal warmth and empathy, sensitivity and emotionalism, grace, charm, compliance, dependence and deference.[29]

She continues,

> The image of woman includes as well some non-characteristics: Lack of aggressiveness, lack of personal involvement and egotism, lack of persistence (unless it be for the benefit of a family member) and lack of ambitious drive.[30]

Unfortunately, the core of attributes found in most professional and occupational roles is considered to be masculine: persistence and drive, personal dedication, aggressiveness, emotional detachment and a kind of sexless matter-of-factness equated with intellectual performance. Those women who attempt to combine the"female" and "professional" role configuration are under a good deal of strain. the woman who takes her work seriously has traditionally been viewed as the antithesis of the feminine woman. As Epstein ironically points out, the only way to eliminate this kind of role strain would be to keep female and male roles mutually exclusive, that is, only men and no women could be lawyers, for example. In that way, women would know and stay in their place.

The woman faculty member at F.D.U. is inextricably involved in this role ambivalence. She is reluctant to adopt the aggressive traits normally attributed to political and leadership roles. When she does she is labeled "unfeminine".

Recommendations for College and University Service

1. Faculty and administration should be required to eliminate the underutilization of women on policy-making committees as the law requires - and encouraged to search out willing, able women participants.

2. There must be Committees on the Status of Women, elected by women faculty, to monitor the University's compliance with the anti-discrimination laws. These committees should exist for each college and should function as ancillaries of the general

grievance procedure for faculty.

3. The ongoing Women's Caucus on Women's Rights at each campus should address itself to these and other recommendations.

4. The long-term goal for women's participation on committees should be in proportion to the number of women at F.D.U. Immediate goals should exceed that proportion inasmuch as personnel decisions have produced an inequitable distribution of women faculty.

XII. Personnel Decisions

The data in this section must be evaluated in relation to the statistical data regarding initial appointments, continuing appointments, promotion, tenure and termination relative to men and women at F.D.U.

Respondents were asked their perceptions of differential treatment in relation to hiring, continuing appointment, promotion, entrance level salary and tenure. They were asked to describe any personal experiences of sex discrimination in personnel decisions. In addition, they were asked their perceptions of the extent to which the University is recruiting and advertising to locate women faculty and administrators.

Despite the fact that few women seemed to have knowledge of the salaries of other faculty members, there were notable areas of consensus: 1) Men are preferred at initial hiring; 2) women's salaries at initial hiring are lower; 3) men get promoted even when they are less qualified than women; 4) generally, women are less knowledgeable about how to negotiate for themselves; and 5) women are perceived not to need money, promotion or tenure as much as men.

Some of these perceptions were gleaned from women who had served on personnel committees and on faculty status committees, although few women have served on the latter. Others gained their perceptions through personal experiences. Of the sample, 11 women had been given a terminal contract at one point or another. Some had fought through grievance procedures and been retained; others were in their last year at the University. A few cases were still in process.

Most of the women who perceived no discrimination in the treatment of women in the personnel decision areas, also stated that they had no knowledge of what happened to other faculty members as they progressed through the University. This is again a case of pluralistic ignorance where lack of disclosure in a private University tends to mask inequities.

Patterns of Perception

Although there are many subtle variations in perceptions of sex discrimination, for the purposes of analysis four basic patterns emerged on 2 dimensions: 1) University status [31](high or low) and 2) perception of discrimination (high or low). The patterns were:

1) high status - high perceivers; 2) high status - low perceivers; 3) low status - high perceivers and 4) low status - low perceivers.[32]

Categories 1 and 3 represent women who tend to be highly conscious of both general societal discrimination *and* discrimination at F.D.U., together with a sense of collective involvement with other women. Categories 2 and 4 were far less collectively involved and had internalized societal norms governing traditional women's roles. Differences among the categories primarily revolve around the uncertainty many women have of whether "women who deserve it *can* achieve" - the Horatio Alger perspective - or whether "men are definitely given the preference". This can be viewed as the extent to which women unwittingly blame themselves for being victims of discrimination, versus women's consciousness of themselves as an exploited social class. The more perfectly socialized women are to traditional beliefs that objective achievement, not sex-linked evaluations, and that competence. rather than sex prejudice, govern academic status, the less likely they are to perceive personal acts of discrimination. These low status, low perceivers accepted their slow progress through the University ranks, attributing it to the emphasis the University places on credentials and productivity, rather than on teaching competence.

For each pattern, one case has been selected which best typifies the category:

Pattern 1. High status, high perceivers.

Now that Dr. A. has high rank and tenure, she feels free to "make waves" and to express her feelings on the treatment accorded women in academe and in society. Dr. A. is actively working for change.

> Women are limited and at a distinct disadvantage all along the career ladder. I feel strongly influenced in my own choice of study by the fact that I am a woman. I felt that this field was more open to women than most and was my most realistic option.
>
> The more imaginative, independent women encounter problems in being hired. A meeker, more traditional woman is preferred. The young, unmarried woman is seen as being untrustworthy - more so than an older, single woman or a married woman. The older woman, single or married, is seen as less of a sex object and less of a threat to men.
>
> Women are hired at lower rank and salary than men. Women are willing to work for less money. Men have easier employment opportunities and easier opportunity for advancement. There are too few faculty women and most of them are in the lower ranks, or part-timers. Women are scarce in the higher ranks of faculty and almost nonexistent in administration. Women have been dismissed even when they were competent.

Dr. A. who has been at F.D.U. for more than ten years, has been a department chairman. At the time of her chairmanship she was made to feel grateful that she could hire women. She now has much stronger feelings about women's rights than she had then, and if she had the opportunity again, she would fight for the right to hire women at higher salaries.

Pattern 2. High status, low perceivers.

"I take discrimination with a grain of salt," said Dr. B., "I didn't feel any discrimination when I was hired by F.D.U. five years ago." Dr. B's field is a highly specialized one in which there are not many women. Dr. B. did know of other women within the University who had not been as well received. Dr. B. felt that other women "had taken [more negative treatment] from men" than she had.

On salary, Dr. B. flatly stated,

> I am not sympathetic to those who accept jobs at a low salary. You negotiate when you come. If you accept a lower price, any institution will go along. When I came, I told them my price, which I based on my degree, experience and competence and they accepted it. I have no complaint about salary.

Dr. B. was made an Associate Professor after four years as an Assistant. Dr. B. did not ask for promotion. She said she was not sure she wanted to stay at F.D.U. and so she didn't fight for promotion when her chairman said "yes" to tenure, but "no" to promotion. "It is easier to move to another institution at the Assistant level." The personnel committee voted against promotion.

But the administration overruled this decision and Dr. B. was promoted.

Pattern 3. Low status, high perceivers.

Dr. C. is highly aware of discrimination against women through personal experience and through her discipline. After experiencing a two-month delay in the conferring of her doctoral degree, she was appointed to the F.D.U. faculty as an Instructor. She has been at the Assistant level for 2 years, after a year as an Instructor and 3 years as a part-timer. She does not have tenure.

> Men are given higher rank without the degree. My initial salary was the minimum they could give me. Men are automatically considered for promotion. Women have to make a special case for it.

Dr. C. feels pressed for time to do research. She has been continually involved with the preparation of new courses. Questioning the tenure policy, she says,

> The tenure policy is rotten. You can't have a sabbatical until you have tenure. F.D.U. is fostering mediocrity by not allowing time off for scholarly activities.

Dr. C. feels that opportunities for women are generally limited and not very great anywhere. She feels that women at F.D.U. are not taken very seriously.

Pattern 4. Low status, low perceivers.

Ms. D. feels that she has always been "one of the boys". Men in her department have always appreciated having women around. She feels there have always been equal opportunities for women in her field although she has read that women scientists feel that they have been discriminated against.

When she was in college, Ms. D. related, "very few women were willing to get ahead in the field because it was so demanding."

> I have always had to perform equally with men and meet the same professional standards. Sometimes women don't carry their full share of the load in the department. The criteria must be that women must be evaluated as to whether or not they are doing a good job, regardless of their sex. My department is full of good people and they are interested in one's performance, or criteria.

Ms. D. has been at F.D.U. since 1959 and has never felt that she was held up on promotion or merit raise. She has no knowledge of how or why people are denied tenure. She feels that she has gotten full recognition for work she has done. She was on part-time status for four years, spent five years as an Instructor and five as an Assistant Professor.

Wider Sampling of Responses

One respondent recalled that her department had once been told to "hire a Teaneck housewife with a Ph.D. - part-time." This might serve as a paradigm for the perception of the University's personnel policies held by many high perceivers. In other words, the employment of a woman with high credentials, as cheaply as possible, was desired. Low perceivers, on the other hand, seem to expect minority status. One respondent claimed that her department was balanced, when actually only one-third are women.

The following statements were made on 1) Recruitment and hiring of women, 2) initial salary and salary increases, 3) promotion, 4) tenure, 5) continuation or retention, and 6) termination and grievance.

1. Recruitment and Hiring of Women

> We have a new nucleus of men in my department and there is no current attempt to recruit or interview women.
>
> Within my department, no special efforts are being made to locate women. I doubt that the University is trying, either. There are far more men here than women.
>
> There are women around here who would make good administrators. As things stand now, women are almost invisible in administration.

2. Initial salary and salary increases

> I learned about the importance of the entry-level salary from my previous job where I was offered $1600 less than a man with comparable qualifications.
>
> As department chairperson, I became aware that less qualified men were given the same entering salary as more highly qualified women.
>
> I requested promotion which was turned down by the grievance committee. Two new deans reversed this decision. I received only a $100 salary increase with the promotion but was so grateful for the promotion that I did not complain.

I know for a fact that discrimination against women in salary and promotion exist. I experienced a two-month delay in the granting of my doctorate. I was appointed as Instructor while men come in as Assistant Professors without doctorates.

When salary decisions were made there was always the feeling 'you don't need the job. Your husband supports you...you're really playing.' I was put down as a dilettante. A full professor said to me, 'You make a fantastic salary for a woman!' It is irrelevant whether a woman needs the money. Absolutely that feeling persists among men that women should get paid less.

3. Promotion

Women are not supposed to want promotion. I was an Assistant Professor for seven years although a male colleague who came in later than I made Associate in three years. Women are third-class citizens. They are kept down.

I have been held at the Assistant Professor rank for nine years because I do not have a doctorate. My department is research-oriented and I am interested in teaching methods courses. I have set up and directed a summer institute in my field under the auspices of a national organization in my discipline. I supervise men who are full professors.

4. Tenure

My student evaluations were high, but I was told that my teaching was unsatisfactory and that I had no 'charisma' when I was denied tenure. I later appealed and won. I had begun to feel that my department was going downhill and urged them to try new things. Whether I would have threatened them if I were a man, I don't know....One woman was granted tenure with very little other than being conscientious in class. She never served on committees, she did no graduate work. She was a 'yes, sir!' person with no ambition who wanted to get along with the men. She had few suggestions. She asked nicely for favors and was not interested in equality.

The ratio of men to women in my department is over six to one. In my second year at the University, I was almost fired because some senior members of the department saw me having lunch with two faculty members who were known as troublemakers. [After extensive questioning, she was thereafter ignored by her colleagues].

5. Continuing Appointment - Contract Renewal

Many men in my department fear women and have difficulty relating to them socially and professionally. As long as women are not too aggressive, it's O.K.

They almost fired me in my second year. The senior members called me in to talk about associating with ____ and ____ - they were known as troublemakers, and I had lunch with them. I assured them I had no connection with these people and that I was happy here. They were reassured.

6. Termination and Grievance

A very good friend of mine was terminated here. She was a little too impressive: Phi Beta Kappa, impeccable credentials, highest student rating, charming and agreeable. She's now doing brilliantly at another University. She could only get part-time at first. She was soon promoted to Associate Professor. Now she's taping courses for TV and represents her University at professional associations.

From a woman who served on the Faculty Status Committee: There is a tendency for department personnel committees to give terminals to women rather than to men for "incompatibility" reasons.

I doubt that women are treated equally. I keep getting one-year terminal contracts - will be getting my third next year.

My senior committee voted for my termination on the grounds that I did not have the Ph.D. However, they proceeded to recommend a male

> Instructor without the Ph.D. for both tenure and promotion to Assistant Professor. He has stated he does not intend ever to try to get a Ph.D. while I am now preparing for my Ph.D. orals.
>
> More women are being hired now, but it also looks like more women are being terminated now.

Comparative Data for Men & Women Faculty*

Highlights gleaned from statistical data comparing men and women faculty over a five-year period, are as follows:

Initial Appointments

Over the past five years, the proportion of initial appointments given to women has declined. From a peak of 38.8% of the new faculty hired in 1969-70, the proportion has dropped to 19.2% in 1972-73.

---

* Uneven distributions of men and women faculty often exaggerate benefits for very small numbers of women, when percentaged in relation to an already small proportion of women in the population. This is particularly noted with promotions and tenure.

Table 12.

University - wide

Initial Appointment

1972-73

	M	% of Men of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment	W	% of Women of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment
Professor	3	5.8	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	10	19.2	1	1.9
Asst. Prof.	21	40.4	5	9.6
Instructor	8	15.4	4	7.7
Total(52)	42	80.8	10	19.2

1971-72

	M	% of Men of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment	W	% of Women of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment
Professor	4	7.7	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	6	11.5	1	1.9
Asst. Prof.	20	38.5	7	13.5
Instructor	10	19.2	4	7.7
Total(52)	40	76.9	12	23.1

1970-71

	M	% of Men of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment	W	% of Women of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment
Professor	2	4.7	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	7	16.3	2	4.7
Asst. Prof.	14	32.6	4	9.3
Instructor	9	20.9	5	11.6
Total(43)	32	74.4	11	25.6

1969-70

	M	% of Men of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment	W	% of Women of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment
Professor	1	2.0	1	2.0
Assoc. Prof.	2	4.1	3	6.2
Asst. Prof.	12	24.5	6	12.2
Instructor	15	30.6	9	18.4
Total(49)	30	61.2	19	38.8

1968-69

	M	% of Men of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment	W	% of Women of Total Faculty Receiving Initial Appointment
Professor	1	1.2	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	7	8.5	1	1.3
Asst. Prof.	39	47.6	7	8.5
Instructor	16	19.5	11	13.4
Total(82)	63	76.8	19	23.2

For women in 1972-73 it was twice as likely that their initial appointment would be at the Instructor rank, rather than Assistant Professor, that it was for men. Also in 1972-73, almost five times as many men as women were hired initially at Assistant Professor rank, and ten times as many men as women were hired as Associate Professors. Not one women was hired at full Professor rank although almost 6% of the new hires were men full Professors.

In 1972-73, 40.4% of the total faculty who received their initial appointment at the Assistant level were males; women constituted only 9.6% of the total faculty hired at the Assistant level. Of the 50% of the total faculty receiving initial appointments at the Assistant level, more than four-fifth were males. At the Associate and Professor level, the picture is even more bleak. 19.2% of the total faculty in the 1972-73 hirings were males who received appointment at the Associate Professor level and 5.8% were males hired at the Professor level. Only 1.9% of the faculty hired were women coming in as Associates; no women were hired at the Professor level.

It is clear that initial hiring is where the pattern of sex discrimination begins, first in the small numbers of women hired even at the point of greatest expansion, when 19 women and 63 men were hired (1968-69); and second, in the lower rank assigned initially to women, as well as salary, compared to male new hires. This initial discrimination paves the way for greatly magnified discrepancies that then become cumulative.

Continuing Appointment

Using 1969-70 as the base year (since 1968-69 was a deviant case in which an unusually high number of men were hired) the trend toward retention of men and women initially hired the previous year went in opposite directions. For men, the proportion of initial and continuing appointments increased reaching a high of 175% by 1972-73; for women, the proportions of initial and continuing appointments decreased each year with only 76.9% continuing in 1972-73.

Table 13. Distribution of Continuing Appointment By Initial Appointment Between Men and Women Faculty

1969-1973

	Men				Women			
	# Initial	Increase or Decrease	# Cont'g	Increase or Decrease	# Initial	Increase or Decrease	# Cont'g	Increas or Decreas
972-73	42	+140.00	42	+175.0	10	-52.63	10	-76.92
971-72	40	+133.33	33	+137.50	12	-63.16	9	-69.23
970-71	32	+106.66	31	+129.17	11	-57.89	10	-76.92
969-70*	30	100.00	34	100.00	19	100.00	13	100.00

Using 1969-70 as the base year and assigning equal values of 100 to men and women.

The proportion of continuing appointments for women has remained fairly constant over the past 5 years ranging from 19.9% in 1968-1969 to 21.0% in 1972-73. While proportions of women given initial appointments and continuation fell over the years 1968-69 through 1972-73, the population of women stabilized around the 20% figure. The means by which this constancy was maintained was the decrease in the hiring of women and the increase in the hiring of men, and the proportions of those new hirings terminated.

For women, the University became a revolving door. Women have come and gone at a much higher rate than men, as reflected in the turnover.

Promotion

As is generally the case with the status of women in the past five years, in the area of promotion, women have again lost ground. At every rank, during that time there have been startling discrepancies in rates of promotion between men and women.

Table 14. University-wide Promotion From Each Rank to Next Higher Rank

	M	% Men of Total Faculty Promoted	W	% Women of Total Faculty Promoted
1972-73				
Professor	-	-	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	16	26.6	1	1.7
Asst. Prof.	18	30.0	10	16.7
Instructor	12	20.0	3	5.0
Total (60)	46	76.6	14	23.4
1971-72				
Professor	-	-	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	8	20.5	-	-
Asst. Prof.	18	46.1	3	7.7
Instructor	9	23.1	1	2.6
Total (39)	35	89.7	4	10.3
1970-71				
Professor	-	-	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	10	19.6	2	3.9
Asst. Prof.	24	47.1	-	-
Instructor	10	19.6	5	9.8
Total (51)	44	86.3	7	13.7
1969-70				
Professor	-	-	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	13	21.0	4	6.5
Asst. Prof.	22	35.4	4	6.5
Instructor	15	24.2	4	6.5
Total (62)	50	80.6	12	19.5
1968-69				
Professor	-	-	-	-
Assoc. Prof.	9	16.4	1	1.8
Asst.Prof.	29	52.6	3	5.5
Instructor	10	18.2	3	5.5
Total (55)	48	87.2	7	12.8

For 1971-72 where 20.5% of the total faculty receiving promotions were men who moved from Associate Professor to Professor, there were no women in this category. In that same year, 46.2% of promotions were males moving from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, whereas only 7.7% of the Assistant Professor to Associate Professor move were women.

The figures for 1972-73 are comparably bleak. The Associate Professor to Professor move was made by men in 26.7% of the promotion cases; women comprised only 1.7% of the promotions from Associate Professor to Professor.

These percentages do not even reflect the full extent of disadvantage for women because 1) women are only 1/5 of the total faculty and of their already small number, relatively negligible numbers get promoted at all. 2) the percentages magnify token cases, e.g., in 1970-71 the 5 women who were promoted from Instructor to Assistant Professor are 9.8% of total faculty promotions, a case of the percent roughly doubling the actual number.

When analyzing whether having the Ph.D. affects the rate of promotion, Table 126B indicates that University-wide, the Ph.D. is of little advantage to women.

Table 15. Comparison of Full-time Faculty Women and Men Who Got Promotion (Compared to Total Faculty)

University-wide

	MEN					WOMEN				
	#Men with Ph.D. Prom.	#Men w/o Ph.D. Prom.	Total with & w/o Ph.D.	Total Men Faculty	% compared to total Men Faculty	#Women with Ph.D. Prom.	#Women w/o Ph.D. Prom.	Total with & w/o Ph.D.	Total Women Faculty	% compared t total Women Faculty
1972-73	31	16	47	388	12.1	7	6	13	100	13.0
1971-72	29	10	39	369	10.6	4	5	9	102	8.8
1970-71	25	21	46	354	13.0	1	6	7	101	6.9
1969-70	31	20	51	351	14.5	2	10	12	102	11.8
1968-69	23	24	47	365	12.9	2	7	9	94	9.6
					Madison					
1972-73	9	1	10	96	10.4	1	2	3	21	14.3
1971-72	3	3	6	94	6.4	1	0	1	17	5.9
1970-71	4	8	12	87	13.8	1	2	3	16	18.8
1969-70	8	4	12	83	14.5	0	0	0	20	-
1968-69	7	4	11	89	12.3	1	3	4	22	18.2
					Rutherford					
1972-73	3	8	11	89	12.4	1	4	5	35	14.3
1971-72	2	2	4	84	4.8	0	1	1	39	2.6
1970-71	7	6	13	81	16.0	0	1	1	42	2.4
1969-70	7	5	12	84	14.3	1	8	9	46	19.6
1968-69	2	7	9	87	10.3	1	3	4	37	10.8
					Teaneck					
1972-73	19	7	26	203	12.8	5	0	5	44	11.4
1971-72	24	5	29	191	15.2	3	4	7	46	15.2
1970-71	14	7	21	186	11.3	0	3	3	43	7.0
1969-70	16	11	27	184	14.7	1	2	3	36	8.3
1968-69	14	13	27	189	14.3	0	1	1	35	2.9

While the Ph.D. correlates with male promotion, it provides no indication for women that their achievement of the degree is rewarded in any way.

This varies by campus. It shows in effect that a policy of non-promotion of people without Ph.D.'s prevails, only for women, at the Teaneck campus. That policy does not apply to men, as evidenced by the 1972-73 figures, showing 7 men without Ph.D. promoted, but no women.

At campuses where women have been promoted without the Ph.D., only token numbers of women have been promoted at all.

In fact as Table 16 indicates, women have spent a considerably longer time in rank before receiving promotion particularly in the Assistant Professor rank at Rutherford, and at Teaneck.

Table 16. Standard Deviation of Women and Men Promoted Among Full-time Faculty, by Time in Rank, 1972-73

	Men	Women
University		
Professor		
Assoc. Prof.	2.01	1.71
Asst. Prof.	2.28	2.88
Instructor	1.63	1.45
Madison		
Professor		
Assoc. Prof.	0.67	0.00
Asst. Prof.	1.61	0.64
Instructor	1.13	1.33
Rutherford		
Professor		
Assoc. Prof.	2.31	2.00
Asst. Prof.	2.37	3.38
Instructor	1.58	1.47
Teaneck		
Professor		
Assoc. Prof.	2.06	1.71
Asst. Prof.	2.04	2.70
Instructor	1.71	1.42

Salary

Over the past 5 years, women have fallen further behind men in salary each year. The average salary differential between men and women at F.D.U. in 1972-1973 was $2,198.00, or 12.4%. When analyzed by campus, the largest gap exists at Teaneck, where the penalty for being a woman results in a $2,946.00 differential, compared to Madison's $1,867.00 and Rutherford's $1,351.00.

Table 17. Average Salaries for Full-time Faculty by Campus and Sex - 1968-1973

	Total Faculty	Avg. Men's Salary	Avg. Women's Salary	Sex Differential Annual Avg. $	%
1972-73					
University-wide	$17,279	$17,730	$15,531	-$2,198	-12.4
Madison	16,537	16,872	15,005	- 1,867	-11.1
Rutherford	16,513	16,894	15,543	- 1,351	- 8.0
Teaneck	18,018	18,720	15,773	- 2,946	-15.7
1971-72					
University-wide	$16,460	$16,891	$14,902	-$1,989	-11.8
Madison	15,831	15,940	15,228	- 712	- 4.5
Rutherford	15,992	16,542	14,807	- 1,735	-10.5
Teaneck	16,997	17,511	14,862	- 2,649	-15.1
1970-71					
University-wide	$14,847	$15,226	$13,521	-$1,705	-11.2
Madison	14,493	14,618	13,814	- 804	- 5.5
Rutherford	14,450	14,944	13,495	- 1,449	- 9.7
Teaneck	15,220	15,632	13,436	- 2,196	-14.0
1969-70					
University-wide	$11,778	$12,045	$10,861	-$1,184	- 9.8
Madison	11,467	11,703	10,489	- 1,214	-10.4
Rutherford	11,509	11,785	11,005	- 780	- 6.6
Teaneck	12,083	12,317	10,883	- 1,434	-11.6
1968-69					
University-wide	$10,218	$10,442	$ 9,351	-$1,091	-10.4
Madison	9,772	9,943	9,124	- 819	- 8.2
Rutherford	9,855	10,080	9,326	- 754	- 7.5
Teaneck	10,636	10,843	9,520	- 1,323	-12.2

When analyzed by rank, every category at every campus reveals a sex differentiation in average salary. Furthermore, when the five-year trend is examined, there is no rank at any campus where women's salaries have matched men's salaries!

Table 18. Distribution of Average Salaries Between Men and Women, by Rank - 1968-69 through 1972-73

University-wide

	Prof.		Assoc.		Asst.		Instr.	
1972-73	m	w	m	w	m	w	m	w
AVG	22,433	21,862	18.730	17,384	15,048	14,535	12,227	11,832
1971-72								
AVG	21,791	21,043	18,069	17,168	14,791	14,633	11,769	11,362
1970-71								
AVG	19,816	18,931	16,448	15,538	13,664	13,518	10,636	10,282
1969-70								
AVG	15,901	14,889	13,161	12,507	11,235	11,069	8,929	8,648
1968-69								
AVG	13,865	12,800	11,649	11,156	10,019	9,750	8,354	8,080

Table 18 shows that at the lower rank of Assistant Professor and Instructor, there was no glaring discrepancy between men and women until 1971. At the 1971-72 point, where salaries were raised, it significantly benefited men at all levels, but did not comparably benefit women at any rank. Women in the three lowest ranks ended by being left even more radically behind men.

An examination of the data by income categories (See Table 19) reveals that no women faculty earn over $25,000 while 17 men do. Almost 100 men earn over $20,000 but only 9 women have reached that level. As with rank, the largest proportion of women are at the lowest salary levels - 35% of the women earn $11-14,000 compared to 17% of the men. Five percent of the women earn under $10,900, while only one and one half percent of the men earn so little.

Variables frequently associated with salary, other than rank, include age, years at the University, years in rank, and the doctorate. The effect of these variables on salary was also examined.

Table 19. Distribution of Selected Ranges of Faculty Salary Levels Among Men and Women. 1972-73

I. University-wide

	Men			Women		
	N	% of total men	% of total faculty	N	% of total women	% of total faculty
25,000 (+)	17	4.4	3.5	0	-	-
20-24,999	99	25.5	20.3	9	9.0	1.8
17-19,999	109	28.1	22.3	24	24.0	4.9
14-16,999	93	24.0	19.1	27	27.0	5.5
11-13,999	64	16.5	13.1	35	35.0	7.2
11,000 (-)	6	1.5	1.2	5	5.0	1.0

Total men: 388 Total Women: 100

II. Madison Campus

	N	% of total men	% of total faculty	N	% of total women	% of total faculty
25,000 (+)	3	3.1	2.6	0	-	-
20-24,999	18	18.8	15.4	1	4.8	0.8
17-19,999	28	29.2	23.9	5	23.8	4.3
14-16,999	21	21.9	17.9	7	33.3	6.0
11-13,999	22	22.9	18.8	7	33.3	6.0
11,000 (-)	4	4.2	3.4	1	4.8	0.8

Total men: 96 Total women: 21

III. Rutherford Campus

	N	% of total men	% of total faculty	N	% of total women	% of total faculty
25,000 (+)	1	1.1	0.8	0	-	-
20-24,999	18	20.2	14.5	2	5.7	1.6
17-19,999	25	28.1	20.2	9	25.7	7.3
14-16,999	28	31.5	22.6	9	25.7	7.3
11-13,999	16	18.0	12.9	14	40.0	11.3
11,000 (-)	1	1.1	0.8	1	2.9	0.8

Total men: 89 Total women: 35

IV. Teaneck Campus

	N	% of total men	% of total faculty	N	% of total women	% of total faculty
25,000 (+)	13	6.4	5.3	0	-	-
20-24,999	63	31.0	25.5	6	13.6	2.4
17-19,999	56	27.6	22.7	10	22.7	4.0
14-16,999	44	21.7	17.8	11	25.0	4.5
11-13,999	26	12.8	10.5	14	31.8	5.7
11,000 (-)	1	0.5	0.4	3	6.8	1.2

Total men: 203 Total women: 44

Age

1) For those under 31 years of age, more than 3 times as many men as women hold the Instructor rank, reflecting discrepancies in hiring.

2) In the dominant age range of 31-55, the leading differences indicate more older women hold lower rank than do older men. No women under 41 hold Professor rank, although 3 men do. Only 1 woman under 46 holds the highest rank, although 11 men under 46 are full Professors.

The years between 30 and 40 are critical career years, and the data show discrimination enhanced during this period. Between ages 31 and 35, men make significant promotion leaps, which continue and grow in the ages 36-40. This is most apparent in the Associate and Assistant Professor ranks. By age 40, (1972-73) 99 men and 22 women held Assistant rank; 56 men and only 8 women held Associate rank. This rank discrepancy shows career growth in the expected pattern for men - but a lack of comparable growth for women.

By age 50, of the total faculty, (111 men compared to 21 women), approximately 25% are males at the Associate level; only 5% of the faculty are female Associates.

Table 20. Distribution of Selected Age Ranges between Men and Women, by Rank, University-wide - 1972-73

Professor Rank

Age Range	Men		Women	
	N	% of Total Professors	N	% of Total Professors
6 - 40	3	3.2	-	-
1 - 45	8	8.6	1	1.1
6 - 50	17	18.3	4	4.3
1 - 55	29	31.2	4	4.3
6 - 60	14	15.1	-	-
1 - 65	13	14.0	-	-

Total Faculty 93: Men 84; 90.3% Women 9; 9.7%

Associate Rank

	N	% of Total Associates	N	% of Total Associates
6 - 30	4	2.3	2	1.2
1 - 35	22	13.2	3	1.8
6 - 40	30	18.0	3	1.8
1 - 45	26	15.6	7	4.2
6 - 50	29	17.4	6	3.6
1 - 55	17	10.2	4	2.4
6 - 60	5	3.0	2	1.2
- 65	5	3.0	2	1.2

Total Faculty 167: Men 138; 82.6% Women 29; 17.4%

Table 20 (cont'd)

Assistant Rank

	Men		Women	
	N	% of Total Assistants	N	% of Total Assistants
26 - 30	24	13.5	6	3.4
31 - 35	37	20.8	12	6.7
36 - 40	38	21.3	4	2.3
41 - 45	19	10.7	10	5.6
46 - 50	11	6.2	6	3.4
51 - 55	2	1.1	4	2.2
56 - 60	4	2.2	1	0.6

Total Faculty 178: Men 135; 75.8% Women 43; 24.2%

Instructor Rank

	N	% of Total Instructors	N	% of Total Instructors
21 - 25	3	6.0	3	6.0
26 - 30	11	22.0	1	2.0
31 - 35	15	30.0	5	10.0
36 - 40	1	2.0	2	4.0
41 - 45	-	-	1	2.0
46 - 50	-	-	4	8.0
51 - 55	1	2.0	3	6.0

Total Faculty 50: Men 31; 62.0% Women 19; 38.0%

Youthful Instructors who might begin their career patterns will certainly encounter discrimination if they are women. The Assistant Professor level, for those under 31 years old, is dominated by men. Approximately 5% of the total faculty are male Assistant Professors under 31 but only 1% of the faculty are female Assistant Professors in that age group. This domination continues at every rank and grows in magnitude for men in the upper ranks. Age as a variable is, then, consistent with the pattern of sex discrimination, that older women are clustered in the lower ranks and this compounds the overall discrepancy in salaries between men and women.

Years at F.D.U.

A similar pattern obtains with years at the University. Women with proportionately more years at F.D.U. than men are clustered in the lower ranks. A smaller proportion of women than men with less then 12 years' experience at F.D.U. have attained Professor rank. In fact, no woman with less than 8 years at F.D.U. is a full Professor, although 15 such men are. Women have to be here longer than men, on the average, for every comparable status.

Table 21. Comparison of Total Years Faculty Service
Men and Women by Rank - 1972-73

University-wide

	Instructor				Asst. Prof.				Assoc. Prof.				Professor			
	M		W		M		W		M		W		M		W	
Yrs.at F.D.U.	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-1	8	15.4	4	7.7	21	40.4	4	7.7	10	19.2	2	3.8	3	5.8		
2-3	11	14.9	4	5.4	32	43.2	10	13.5	13	17.6	1	1.4	3	4.1		
4-5	7	9.2	6	7.9	32	42.1	4	5.3	15	19.7	8	10.5	4	5.3		
6-7	5	5.7	5	5.7	26	29.5	11	12.5	32	36.4	4	4.5	5	5.7		
8-9					15	22.7	11	16.7	26	39.4	6	9.1	7	10.6	1	1.
0-11					5	12.5	1	2.5	18	45.0	2	5.0	14	35.0		
-15					3	5.2	2	3.4	16	27.6	4	6.9	29	50.0	4	6.
6-20					1	3.3			7	23.3	2	6.7	16	53.3	4	13.
1-30									1	25.0			3	75.0		

Women 100
Men 388

Women are not rewarded commensurate with men for the number of years spent at F.D.U. For men there is a consistent upward trend correlating with years at F. D.U.; for women the curve plunges for those here 6-9 years, back to the Assistant Professor rank. It is interesting to note that the only category in which there is an equal representation of men and women is for those serving 6-7 years at the lowest rank, Instructor. At the most significant level of achievement that of Professor, 50% of all those at F.D.U. for 12-15 years are male full Professors. Only 7% of all those here for that length of time are females at the full Professor rank. Almost one-half of those faculty here 10-11 years are male Associate Professors; only 5% here for that length of time are female Associates.

Doctorate

More men proportionate to their total population have the doctorate in each rank than women, except at the Professor level, where proportionately more women are Ph.D.'s. The differences, however, are not that marked at the Associate rank, with 62% of men compared to 52% of women having the doctorate. At the Assistant level, only 30% of the women and 50% of the men have doctorates. It is unlikely that the doctorate is sufficient to explain the differences in salary, promotion, rank and tenure. The difference in the proportions of men and women holding the doctorate is related to the sex-typed fields of physical education and nursing where the Ph.D. is not required, compared to the Department of Dentistry where the DDS is basic.

Table 22. Distribution of Doctorate-holder, among Men and Women Full-time Faculty by Rank - 1972-73

	Men Total	Men Doctorate Holders N	Men Doctorate Holders % of rank	Men Doctorate Holders % of Men Drs.	Women Total	Women Doctorate Holders N	Women Doctorate Holders % of rank	Women Doctorate Holders %of Women Drs.
I. University-wide								
Prof.	84	68	80.9	30.2	9	8	88.9	22.2
Assoc.	138	86	62.3	38.2	29	15	51.7	41.7
Asst.	135	67	49.6	29.8	43	13	30.2	36.1
Instr.	31	4	12.9	1.8	19	0	-	-
Total	388	225	58.0		100	36	36.0	100.0
II. Madison Campus								
Prof.	12	11	91.7		1	1	100.0	12.0
Assoc.	38	27	71.0		7	4	57.1	50.0
Asst.	35	19	54.3		9	3	33.3	38,0
Instr.	11	1	9.1		4	0	-	0.0
								100.0
III. Rutherford Campus								
Prof.	13	10	76.9		2	1	50.0	12.0
Assoc.	32	17	53.1		12	5	41.7	63.0
Asst.	34	13	38.2		13	2	15.4	25.0
Instr.	10	3	30.0		8	0	-	0.0
								100.0
IV. Teaneck Campus								
Prof.	59	47	79.7		6	6	100.0	30.0
Assoc.	68	42	61.8		10	6	60.0	30.0
Asst.	66	35	53.0		21	8	38.1	40.0
Instr.	10	0	-		7	0	-	0.0
								100.0

As Table 22 reveals, for women the doctorate does not command higher rank as much as it does for men. More women with doctorates remain Assistant Professors than do men, particularly at Teaneck where more women with doctorates are Assistant Professors than Associate Professors; for men it is reversed.

Summary of salary variables

More of the additional variables considered appear to corroborate the discriminatory pattern of salary differentials, rather than explain it. Women are older, longer at the University, and longer in rank than men before moving up the ladder. Even when they have the Ph.D., they are not as likely to be promoted and therefore receive salary increases, as are men. In a five-year analysis of promotion trends, far fewer women with Ph.D.'s were promoted.

Tenure

Of the total faculty, 7.8% are tenured women, compared to 37.7% of the total faculty being tenured men. This approximates the total percentage of faculty who are women. The fact that women are much more likely to be hired at Instructor rank prejudices their opportunity to gain tenure.

The proportions of tenured appointments, 83% men and 17% women, reflects the under-representation of women currently at the University. The already disproportionate under-representation of women is maintained and in fact, extended through the denial of tenure.

Table 23. Percentage Distribution of Tenure among Faculty Men and Women by Rank - 1972-73

I. University-wide

	Men				Women			
	Total in Rank	N	Tenure % of Total Faculty	% of Men Faculty	Total in Rank	N	Tenure % of Total Faculty	% of Women Faculty
			N=488	N=388			N=488	N=100
Prof.	84	74	15.2	19.1	9	9	1.8	9.0
Assoc.	138	80	16.4	20.6	29	17	3.5	17.0
Asst.	135	30	6.1	7.7	43	12	2.5	12.0
Instr.	31	-	-	-	19	-	-	-
Total	388	184	37.7	47.4	100	38	7.8	38.0

Total Tenured Faculty: 222; Men 83%; Women 17%

When examined by rank, the granting of tenure becomes less likely as women progress through the ranks. At Assistant level, 16.4% of the total faculty are tenured men; only 2.5% are tenured women Assistant Professors. If women are able to reach the level of Associate Professor, they have their best opportunity for tenure; of the total faculty 6% are male tenured Associate Professors; 3.5% are female tenured Associates. But at the highest level, Professor, while 15.2% of the total faculty are tenured males, only 1.8% are tenured women.

Leaving the University

Women faculty have tended to leave the University in higher proportions relative to their numbers than men. In 1968-1969, 34% of the women faculty left compared to 23% of the men faculty for reasons of non-renewal contracts (for those here under 3 years); resignation because of termination; resignation for other positions or retirement. In 1972-1973, 26% of the women and only 19% of the men left for such reasons.

Table 24. Summary of Faculty who Left the University (not including death)

	Men		Women	
	# Left	% of Total Men Faculty	# Left	% of Total Women Faculty
		1972-73		
Instr.	3	9.7	4	21.1
Asst.	8	5.9	2	4.6
Assoc.	5	3.6	-	-
Prof.	-	-	-	-
Total	16	19.2	6	25.7
		1971-72		
Instr.	4	10.5	4	18.2
Asst.	14	10.2	7	13.2
Assoc.	3	2.4	-	-
Prof.	-	-	-	-
Total	21	23.1	11	31.4
		1970-71		
Instr.	8	17.8	2	7.7
Asst.	6	4.5	1	2.0
Assoc.	4	3.5	2	13.3
Prof.	1	1.7	1	10.0
Total	19	27.5	6	33.0
		1969-70		
Instr.	10	17.8	10	28.6
Asst.	17	11.4	2	4.8
Assoc.	-	-	1	5.9
Prof.	-	-	-	-
Total	27	29.2	13	39.3
		1968-69		
Instr.	6	9.4	6	16.7
Asst.	28	16.3	2	5.1
Assoc.	7	7.5	2	12.5
Prof.	-	-	-	-
Total	41	23.2	10	34.3

In the context of growing consciousness of the need for Affirmative Action, the University has made no effort to at least retain the proportion of women which they started in the base year 1969-70. Rather, the findings show that as women have left they have been replaced by men.

Another pattern relating to terminations that emerged is that of women who receive terminal contracts not exercising their right to use grievance procedures. Only 52.9% of the women, compared to 83.8% of the men took their cases to grievance. When they did, however, the outcome was equally favorable. In twice as many cases, both women and men were continued as an outcome of grievance procedures, in relation to those who left.

Table 25. Outcome of Grievances by Sex - 1969-1970 through 1972-1973

	Total # Faculty	Total # Terminations	Total # Grievances	% of Termins.	% of Fac. Filing Griev.	Outcome			
						Cont'd	%	Left	
Men	1,462	47	31	66.0	2.1	20	67	11	3
Women	405	17	9	52.9	2.2	6	67	3	3

Overview of Perceptions and Actual Status of Women

Women respondents barely perceived the dramatic difference between men and women full-time faculty in the distribution of faculty, rank, salary and tenure. Most were moderate in their belief that such discrimination exists, and even the high perceivers of discrimination had no impression equal to the impact of the statistical data. The "pluralistic ignorance" concept again emerges as the most plausible hypothesis to explain their low perception of discrimination. A rival hypothesis would be that women do not expect equality of professional status. Still a third would be that they feel they do not deserve it, because of career interruptions, lesser productivity, etc.

Increasingly, the thrust of government vis-a-vis equal pay for equal work is moving away from test scores and credentials unless they can be proved to be job-related, following the landmark Supreme Court decision, Griggs vs. Duke Power Company.[33] While this case did not refer to academic institutions, some authorities have questioned the rank structure and requirement for the Ph.D. as a possible application of the Griggs formula. As a primarily teaching institution, even research and publishing activities may become questionable requisites for status improvements. But as long as the doctorate, years at the University and publishing are considered the criteria of merit, women must be rewarded equally with men for these achievements. Clearly, inequities of the past cry out for redress.

Summary of "Personnel Decisions" Responses

Perhaps it is unreasonable to expect a smooth academic career, but very few women at Fairleigh Dickinson University have experienced one. Most of those who have remained here have had to fight for promotion and for tenure. This, of course, does not account for those who fought and lost. No count has yet been made of the number of women who have resigned voluntarily or who have been fired since the University was founded. However, the pattern appears to be clearly one of a revolving door. Women have frequently been hired as full-time faculty at the lowest ranks possible. Often they have taught part-time but are given no recognition or credit toward rank and tenure. They have been hired at lower salaries, given promotions less regularly and have been denied tenure more frequently than men. These impressions are based not only on the reports of women in this study, including those who have been here for many years, but on the statistical data available.

The leading factors reported by the women themselves as detrimental to their career have been the lack of the doctorate, the lack of visible committee work and insufficient time for research and publication. These are the factors that have been found to be most clearly associated with the time fragmentation inherent in assuming the roles of housewife, mother and professional woman. Women who have taken years out of their careers to devote to home and family return to the professional world at a considerable disadvantage.

The question of what institutional support can be given to enable women to pursue their careers as fully as men do, is at issue. It must be recognized, however, that nothing short of societal re-socialization will secure for women the structural opportunities to pursue a career with full commitment. If men at all levels do not truly accord women equal privileges and rights, minor adjustments in salary inequities will not go far toward true equalization of the status of women in academe. Positive discrimination, as S. M. Miller terms it, is necessary to make opportunities for women more equal in practice.[34] The data indicate that the presumption of meritocracy is ill-founded; that women are not being judged by the same standards but by more rigorous standards than their male colleagues at F.D.U.

Recommendations for Personnel Practices

The University by its discrimination in initial hiring, continuing appointment, promotion, salary and tenure policies (or ambiguity of policy since there are no universal criteria) is acting against the law and invites class action on the part of women, not only for redress but for reparations. Such reparations, in analogous situations, viz. Rutgers University, have been awarded not only to standardize compensation but also punitively against those who stand in defiance of federal law.

It is urged that the University take immediate steps to place itself in compliance with the law. Lest the charges of "reverse discrimination" be levelled against us, it must be stated at the outset that, far from being any kind of discrimination at all, the equalization of women's status will be a too-long-delayed first step toward justice. A useful model of justice if that of John Rawls who stresses that social and economic inequalities must be arranged to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged.[35] This concept is most appropriate to the status of women at F.D.U.

1) Recruitment

Efforts to recruit qualified women faculty must be expanded. Every department should be obliged to make the maximum effort to recruit, interview and employ qualified women. Recruitment efforts should not be restricted to positions typically thought to be suitable to women.

In determining the size of the available labor pool, women graduates with advanced degrees, whether currently employed and actually seeking employment or not should be included. Many qualified women, including faculty wives, who have been unemployed or employed part-time, or denied tenure and unable to relocate, might be suitable candidates.

All departments should advertise in women's caucus journals of professional associations for prospective women candidates.

Every department is required by law to recruit, interview and offer positions to qualified women.

2) Initial Hiring

Rank and salary offers to initial appointees must be commensurate with qualifications, not sex or marital status.

The recruitment of part-time highly qualified women must not be used as a substitute for full-time appointments of women.

Full-status part-time positions should be created for men and women who desire them for health, research or child-rearing purposes.

3) Continuing Appointment

Criteria applied to renewal decisions must have no reference to sex such as assuming married women are less in need of the position.

In order to accomplish a more equitable proportion of women among faculty at F.D.U., every effort should be made to retain every woman performing at a level equivalent to the minimal male performance in that department.

The University should identify those departments in which women have tended to be non-renewed disproportionately, and correct the imbalance.

Criteria and procedures used in evaluating faculty should be made explicit to assure maximum objectivity and justice in decisions affecting reappointment, promotion, tenure and salary.

4) Criteria for promotion should be established that would result in a pattern of women distributed among all ranks at least in the same proportion as men.

In order to redress the unequitable pattern or promotion of women in the past, special effort should be made to locate and promote women equal to the rank and salary of comparable men, (or to the rank equal to that held by the least qualified man in that rank at each campus).

Administrative officers should be charged with the responsibility for issuing guidelines to departments covering all personnel status decisions and for reviewing the implementation of guidelines to discover problem areas.

5) Salary

The Personnel Office should determine which individual women have suffered salary inequities and propose a method for eliminating such inequities. Rather than utilize average or median salary levels which blur the extremes extant at F.D.U., correction should bring women to a level comparable to men of similar time at the University.

Salary increases applied across-the-board should follow, not precede the redress of inequities for women.

6) Tenure

The proportion of women given tenure must increase to retain those qualified women necessary to raise the proportion of women faculty. Non-renewals of contracts and terminal contracts should be avoided in order to overcome the past disadvantage of rapid turnover of women at all campuses.

Special consideration should be given to "stretch-out" to tenure for those women and men who choose the option of dividing home/career responsibilities more equitably. Parental leave or child-rearing leave should not penalize such faculty members from gaining tenure.

Pro-rated credit toward tenure should be extended to part-time teaching

Short-term leaves (under 1 year) should not endanger a woman faculty member from gaining tenure, unless men are similarly penalized. In other words, leaves of absence for any purpose must not discriminate in their effects upon women.

In general, overcoming discriminatory practices will require not only changes in structural policies but in habits of mind. The University should immediately undertake educational orientations to gain the cooperation of all members of the academic community in this endeavor and to avert the backlash which often accompanies social change.

XIII University Policies and Benefits

Interviewees were asked about their knowledge about existing University policies in 8 areas. They were also asked about their perceptions of the benefits or deficiencies resulting to women academics in comparison to the benefits they desired.

Respondents Perceptions of Nepotism

Approximately 1/3 of the University women did not know what the University policy toward nepotism was. Interpretations of the terms included cronyism, or appointing friends and relatives of University employees, and husband and wife teams on faculty.

While almost 1/3 of the respondents did not know what the University policy toward nepotism was and 15% perceived no discrimination against women in University policies, a considerable number of women (18%) did note one form of cronyism or another that exists or has existed in the past at F.D.U. This cronyism evoked strong feelings on the part of respondents that steps should be taken toward its elimination.

The primary form of nepotism noted was that of favoritism toward relatives including brothers, fathers and sons and friends. It was seen as "In the Italian tradition to give the best jobs to one's friends."

Old males were favored by most of these cronyism patterns.

> Male nepotism is phenomenal on this campus. Informal male-dominant patterns beget male-dominant patterns: role ascriptions, contact with other universities are predominantly male. There is more concern over men being the family provider than for women in that position.

Another form of nepotism noted was that the University recruits its own graduates for fellowships and faculty positions.

Many women felt there is no policy against the hiring of husband and wife teaching teams. But almost as many believed that a policy existed, referring to reports that faculty wives do not get tenure and faculty wives cannot teach here. They cited part-time women faculty whose husbands have full-time appointments, while the wives have been on letter of appointment for many years. A policy prohibiting married couples as dental students was cited by one faculty woman. Only a few women stated that they believed there is no nepotism at the University or that there is no discrimination against women because of anti-nepotism policies.

In terms of what was desirable policy, the largest group of respondents referred to the AAUP policy on nepotism, which is primarily directed at ending the inherent favoritism toward male members of husband and wife professional teams. The AAUP policy calls for the repeal of anti-nepotism rulings in higher education on the grounds that they unfairly restrict the professional opportunities of academic women.[36]

Existing Policies

Most University policies considered in this section were in the process of revision and codification. Several sources then, were researched to provide data.

The current policy as stated in October 1973, by the University Director of Personnel provides that "Two full-time faculty members of the same family may not work in the same academic department, but that an amendment is being considered to comply with affirmative action requirements."[37] In practice, however, the then Vice President for Academic Affairs stated in an interview that he advised provosts and deans that there should be no bar to the hiring of spouses, except that no individual should be in a position to make personnel recommendations affecting his immediate family. (Family is defined as: children, parents, brothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, uncles, aunts, nieces, nephews, cousins and grandparents). But they should not be considered for department chairman if another member of the family is in the department. He saw it as in agreement with committee W policy of AAUP.

The then Vice-President was aware that in the past anti-nepotism policies have been applied in a uni-directional way against women.[38]

The Assistant Vice-President for Academic Services, in an interview, interpreted the policy to mean that a husband and wife do not function within the same college or department and that the restriction on hiring of family does not go beyond the husband and wife relationship.[39] In relation to the staff, the University policy is clearly stated. In this case, two members of the same family may not work in the same department. It was acknowledged that the individual's ability to negotiate determines how closely this policy is enforced in actual practice.

In comparing the perceptions of women faculty to the statements of actual policy, it is apparent that considerable confusion and sentiment against favoritism of a political nature exist. This is referred to as "cronyism" by women faculty. Women who were more knowledgeable about this issue, supported the AAUP policy which was seen not to penalize faculty wives.

Recommendations for Anti-nepotism Policies

1) All anti-nepotism rules should be abolished as they affect the equal employment opportunity of women. The only restriction permitted by law is that

> faculty members should neither initiate or participate in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, promotion, salary, leave of absence, etc.) to members of their immediate families.

Nepotism rules are not the appropriate way to resolve anticipated conflicts. Relatives should be asked to absent themselves if the agenda concerns one of them.

2) In the search for academic competence and excellence, effort should be made to remedy past injustices that excluded wives of faculty members. Faculty wives are a potential resource for the labor pool and women's caucus. They should be encouraged to use their education and training.

Respondents Perceptions of Maternity Leave

Two-fifths of the women faculty respondents did not know what the current policies were in relation to maternity leave. This is hardly surprising, since the then Academic Vice President said there is no written maternity leave policy, while the Director of Personnel stated a definite policy. Of those who knew, the great majority (58%) were dissatisfied with present maternity leave policies. More respondents perceived discrimination in relation to this policy than any other. Reasons for dissatisfaction ranged from the non-inclusion of maternity benefits in hospitalization, loss of time toward tenure because of short-term leaves for maternity purposes, the engendering of departmental hostility because of maternity, loss of salary during semesters' leaves of absence, fear of replacement, and instances of termination following maternity. Excerpts include:

> I got two weeks of sick leave as maternity leave during my first two years at F.D.U. After that I got no pay. Since returning, I have missed no classes. When I was pregnant my chairman felt pregnancy was not proper in academia.
> (This woman is now on a terminal contract)

> I was refused a sabbatical because I had had a maternity leave. Maternity leave is an invitation to slow death. It leads up to replacement, not resumption of status. If a woman wants to raise an infant she is penalized. If maternity leaves were granted for one term with the following term optional to resume at half-time in rank with half-time committee assignments and half-time toward tenure, then women would no longer be penalized.

> I lost everything when I went on maternity leave. It's an up-in-the air policy.

> I know of a woman given terminal leave because of maternity leave. If a man is sick and needs a prostate operation, he can stay out for months.

> I have maternity leave of one semester without pay. The University continues to pay its share for fringe benefits. This arrangement took some letters to accomplish and took a while for the response to come through. The policies could be more liberal and more freely granted. Private universities think they can do what they want but those days are over-they'll have to come through with a better policy.

> When I was pregnant, I kept teaching. I had the baby in June. I chose to teach and didn't inquire about leave but there should be maternity leave. Next time I should be granted a maternity leave.

> When pregnant with my third child I offered to resign. The chairman said I could take three weeks off if I could get someone to cover, whom I would pay.

Several other faculty women stated that they planned their babies for summer without expressing any dissatisfaction with such expectations.

One woman went so far as to say:

> Women who want equality should ask for no special favors. I took a $500.00 cut that I asked for as a Harvard University post-doctoral student to have the right to leave if my husband or children were sick, so that none of the others could say favoritism existed.

Several women proposed that parental leave for either husband or wife should be stated policy. Others suggested varying lengths of time from two months, consisting of six weeks before and six weeks after, to one semester leave followed by one semester half-time.

Actual Policies

In practice, women have taken leaves of absence without pay as their maternity leave. If it is short term leave, it is treated as illness or sick leave. The advantage to unwritten policy is that of flexibility. People cover for each other. The then Vice-President for Academic Affairs felt that we should have a maternity leave policy including a short duration leave for fathers. This is difficult to schedule since oftentimes the need is not immediately after childbirth but several weeks later, especially when there are other children in the family.

The University Director of Personnel stated the current policy to be:

> a full-time faculty employee who becomes pregnant may plan on working to the end of the sixth month of pregnancy, provided that she is physically competent and desires to work. Employment beyond the end of the sixth month is permitted only with the consent of the employee, her doctor, and her department head.

He added that an amendment is being considered to comply with affirmative action guidelines.

On this issue, discrepancy between the perception of women and that of administrators is over the type of maternity leave policy which should be enforced, and what continuing benefits should be maintained during such leave.

Recommendations for Maternity Leave Policies

Other sources have compared the childbearing function as important to the national society in the same magnitude as that of veterans performing war-time service. If indeed, society wishes to maximize the contribution of professional women at the same time as it encourages maintaining the childbearing and primary responsibility for childrearing, institutional policies will necessarily have to reflect such altered priorities and provide positive rewards.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines require:

> disabilities caused or contributed to by pregnancy, miscarriage, abortion, child-

> birth and recovery therefore are, for all job-related purposes, temporary disabilities and should be treated as such under any health or temporary disability insurance or sick leave plan available in connection with employment.[40]
>
> On the other hand, studies have indicated that married women with children have fared least well in rhe academic community generally. Pro-natalist policies then must be recognized as inherently discriminatory.[41]

1) It is, therefore, recommended that F.D.U. maternity leave benefits be extended to include full salary for two months for optional maternity leave, without penalty or loss of time toward tenure. 2) Unpaid maternity leave should be available up to two years, with the guarantee of job reservation in the same or equivalent position. 3) TIAA restriction of disability benefits resulting from pregnancy should be removed, as well as F.D.U. mandatory maternity leave.

4) Child-rearing leave - unpaid leaves of absence for child-rearing purposes should be available to parents of either sex. Parents who request such leave should have the same employment rights with respect to benefits, promotion and tenure as other leaves of absence.

Respondents Perceptions of Sick Leave

A majority of the respondents felt that sick leave policies are fair to women, although more than 1/3 did not know what the sick leave policies included. Lack of knowledge of a benefit such as sick leave is tantamount to its nonexistence. The following comment came from a woman who has been a full-time faculty member for 10 years at F.D.U.

> I am not aware of any sick leave for any purpose. I believe you are docked for not attending classes. At least that's the implication. When I am sick I make other arrangements. I let the department secretary know and the day or evening office, asking them to notify class. There are no benefits that I am aware of.

The perceptions included: "nebulous guidelines"; a feeling that "the short-term policy has proved to be fair but not the long-term"; and that women appear more reluctant to take sick leave. Whether this is a question of stoicism or lack of knowledge that it is an acceptable norm is unclear. "Sick leave policies depend on the generosity of the department chairman," stated a respondent.

About 10% of the women cited personal experiences corroborating their satisfaction with the sick leave policy. These ranged from receiving ten days sick leave for an operation at intersession to the report of one woman suffering extended illness which required four months sick leave at one time and six weeks at another. She felt treated very well indeed by the University. Another was out a month and had people in her department covering for her.

The general pattern of utilization of both maternity and sick leave was hardly corroborative of the traditional rationale of excessive absenteeism due to childbearing and rearing offered in the past for not hiring women. The dominant profile of the current full-time faculty woman is that of the young, childless woman or the returnee with older children. There are few married women with young children at the University, confirming the penalty that child-rearing imposes on uninterrupted career patterns. Full-time faculty women are a healthy, constant and committed group. In general, they do not expect the University to offer them any unusual privileges or compensation for fulfilling both their home and career committments.

Actual Policies

A faculty member with two or more years of continuing full-time appointment will receive full salary for the first two months of disability and 60% of base salary during the next 4 months. Disability insurance takes effect for such personnel after six months of a disabling illness with the University paying 75% of the premium for 8 years of full-time employment and thereafter paying the full premium. This TIAA insurance is optional and premium rates are the same for men and women.

During the prior six months, a faculty member with less than two years of continuing appointment receives a substitute for the first two weeks. After this time, the cost is charged against the absent faculty member's salary. However, any leave is deducted from time toward tenure. It is not known how practice may differ from the stated policy in the area of sick leave.

Recommendations for Sick Leave Policy

1) Maternity leave should not be considered an illness and therefore should be dissociated from sick leave. 2) A more clearly stated, liberal policy of temporary sick leave should be formulated and publicized widely to all academic employees.

Respondents Perceptions of Loss of Seniority

The majority of respondents did not know if there is a loss of seniority resulting from absences due to maternity leave, sick leave or hospitalization. A substantial proportion felt that there is no discrimination between men and women in the loss of seniority. One or two commented that any hiatus for either men or women should affect one's status. The most frequent perception of loss of seniority was believed to be related to maternity leave and was objected to by about 10% of the sample. One long-time faculty woman believed that women probably lose time toward tenure and questioned why they should.

> I know they gave men time to go off for two years to take a Fulbright award and to loll

> in the sun and enjoy themselves. I know one who came back to a promotion, but a woman could not do that.

Actual Policy

The term "loss of seniority" was viewed by administrators as being different from "time toward tenure". They stated that men and women are treated equally in terms of leave of absence affecting their tenure. There is no strict policy for the number of years spent in rank before promotion, therefore it is difficult to assess whether maternity or sick leave has resulted in the loss of seniority.

Recommendations

1) Universal criteria for leave must be followed, for men and women.

2) Child-bearing or child-rearing leaves must not result in loss of seniority.

3) Leave of absence for residency at graduate school, for both men and women to complete the dissertation, should be added to a liberalized leave policy.

Respondents Perceptions of LIfe Insurance

Approximately 1/3 of the women perceived no discrimination in the life insurance policies of the University. A smaller percentage than in other categories did not know what the life insurance benefits were (17%). Among those who did perceive discrimination, some felt that single women should not have to carry it. They would rather have their income raised than have this type of fringe benefit. Some cited discrimination in the past when women were not allowed to insure their spouses, but men were. Some women felt that fringe benefits are greater for men because women live longer. A few women noted that their husbands carry life insurance and therefore considered University life insurance superfluous.

The disinterest of the majority of women in this policy benefit reflects the larger societal emphasis on insuring the lives of men as the dominant breadwinner. Despite the fact that so many women are single, separated, widowed or divorced, women are still not used to the concept of self-insurance based on their professional status.

Actual Policy

All full-time faculty members are eligible to enroll, at the time of full-time employment, for life insurance coverage. Coverage is provided, at no cost to the employee, for one times annual salary equivalency, with the option to pay a premium for an additional one times annual salary equivalency at his/her own expense. The new Prudential policies replace the old TIAA policy which was decreasing term insurance, in which every individual was paid the same amount. Under the new policy, benefits are linked with salaries. Since term insurance was more beneficial for younger persons, F.D.U. retained TIAA for those younger persons whose benefits were greater under TIAA, until such point as their benefits intersect with those under Prudential. They then will be automatically switched to the new coverage. Premium rates for contributory coverage are the same for male and female faculty members.

Some women would have preferred salary increases instead of fringe benefits, which they do not value. In addition the new policy is non-actuarial, since the benefits are linked to salary, not to expected life span. This means that discrimination in salary now affects benefits. Life insurance benefits, therefore, suffer from salary inequities experienced by women faculty.

Recommendations

1) The most significant remedy for discriminatory life insurance policies is the equalization of women's salaries. The University should also consider extending the option to members of working families whereby one partner may elect to take the fringe benefit, while the other chooses the salary equivalent. In most cases at this University, it is the woman whose husband is covered by some other institution who would opt for the salary equivalent, but it is conceivable that this University's benefits might be better than the husband's policies and the couple might elect F.D.U.'s policy. Unless this option is granted, the benefit offered to many women is meaningless.

2) To partially remedy the deficiency for women who take child-rearing time out of their careers, life insurance payments could be continued by the University for a period such as six years to compensate for the lack of salary increase during those years.

Respondents Perceptions of Hospitalization

More than half the women respondents believed that there is no discrimination in the hospitalization benefits available for women. Some cited the policies as "very good - also covers my self-employed husband" or that "they are very good because they now cover abortion." Fewer women were unaware of the hospitalization policy than any other policy.

One women, pregnant at the time, believed maternity benefits were not covered by hospitalization. Of the few women who felt there was discrimination in hospitalization benefits, the reasons cited were: the belief that abortion was not covered; that gynecological examinations were not covered; that pregnancy tests were not covered and an objection to the need to change one's name to the marital name in order to qualify for maternity benefits. Several women objected to having to carry hospitalization since their husbands' policies covered both. This again was a benefit which was meaningless to some women. One woman had to pay her obstetrician's bill because she was not aware that "family coverage" had to be specifically requested in order to cover doctor's payments for maternity. Another woman complained that abortion was not covered although her husband's two illnesses were covered. One woman had a personal experience with a gynecological exam being disallowed by the University plan.

Actual Policies

All full-time faculty members are eligible to enroll in a Hospital/Surgical Plan (Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Rider J) and Major Medical Insurance (TIAA) the first of the month following thirty days of full-time employment. The University pays 100% of the premium for the employee's own coverage and 50% of cost of dependent coverage if elected by the employee. The premium rates are the same for male or female.

a) Maternity - Coverage available on single coverage or parent and child coverage after continuous enrollment of 240 days.

b) Services in connection with miscarriages, abortions or premature labor rendered prior to the 28th week of pregnancy are covered only if rendered in the hospital.

c) Gynecological Testing - (Pap tests, pregnancy tests, etc.) are not eligible for coverage if in routine physical exams. If done for diagnostic purposes solely, they are covered. In any event, they are covered by the Major Medical Plan after deductibles are met.[42]

Recommendations

1) The restrictions of the hospitalization benefits offered in terms of abortion, pregnancy and gynecological tests, name change requirement and benefits to unwed mothers should be eliminated in the future. 2) The University should represent its women constituency in

attempting to change carriers' provisions. As with life insurance, women should have the option to choose equivalent salary in place of fringe benefit where spouse's policy has superior benefits.

Respondents Perceptions of Pension and Retirement Benefits

More women (20%) perceived discrimination in pension rights than in any other University policy, except maternity. Fewer women (12%) did not know what their pension benefits were in relation to the policy than any other, except hospitalization. Nevertheless, 45% perceived no discrimination in pension policies. Most of those were unaware of any differential benefits and assumed none existed. Some women accepted the actuarial basis which contends women live longer and therefore deserve smaller monthly benefits for a projected longer period of time.

Among those who perceived the benefits as discriminatory were those who felt one waited too long for eligibility at 28 years of age or 2 years of a continuing appointment under contract. One woman stated,

> I don't know if it's discriminatory but women under pressure don't live longer. It should be an individual option as to monthly payments or a lump sum upon retirement.

One young woman originally had felt that this was her husband's problem since she didn't expect to stay that long at the University. She now perceives her former attitude as irresponsible and she has enrolled in the pension plan. When she discovered that the monthly payments for pension rights are smaller for women, her first response was to challenge this, but the probability of the longer life span convinced her of its justice.

Most women were not knowledgeable about the TIAA differential benefits for women compared to men, but all of those who were objected to it. One woman felt that it was necessary to confront the discrepancy in TIAA benefits on a national basis.

One of the senior women faculty members described the paternalistic attitude that prevailed 15 years ago when low salaries were said to be compensated for by a pension plan. She stated,

> It is better regulated now but 15 years ago it was criminal. We had been told that we were getting low salaries because money was being put into a pension plan for us. I am one of those who will suffer from this. I wonder where that money went. The last 8 years have been better. The pension and all the fringe benefits, were very patronizing - 'Papa will take care of you.' I thought I was protected and found out I was not.

The most significant finding in this area relates to the fact that so few women know that their actual monthly benefits will be less than those of men earning the same salary.

Actual Policies

> The current pension plan provides eligibility for all full-time faculty to participate in the TIAA/CREF Pension Plan after attaining both age 28 and completion of two years of continuing full-time appointment under contract.

> The contribution rate is 5% by the University and 5% by the employee of the individual's annual base salary.
>
> There is a differential on pension payout based on accepted actuarial life expectancy tables used by almost all carriers wherein females of the same age as a male at retirement would receive a lesser pension payout. This differential is being challenged in the courts.[43]

In previous years, many individual arrangements were made with private carriers. These were highly individualized promises of retirement benefits of which the University has no record. Administrators only learn of them when presented with letters held by individuals in which such promises have been made.

Older people often get minimal benefits. Therefore, they must continue working. The question of whether this policy practice is discriminatory toward women can best be considered in relation to the lesser ability of women to negotiate individual differences in other working condition areas. It is highly unlikely that many women faculty have wrested such promises from previous administrations.

Recommendations

1) The TIAA controversy over sex differentials in retirement annuity payments should be aired within the University, and faculty members should be kept informed of the legal status of the issue in the courts. It is recommended that the University choose the option of

seeking to equalize benefits, rather than payments, for men and women faculty, by contributing more for women than for men until such time as TIAA policy can be changed. This is in keeping with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines, which hold differential benefits in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Respondents Perceptions of Social Security

Respondents perceptions about Social Security were probed despite the fact that the University is bound by federal laws, in order to determine whether women perceived any discriminatory practices as a result of the national retirement system. Very few women did not know what their Social Security benefits were and approximately 1/4 felt there was no discrimination in the laws. Approximately 1/5 of the women perceived discrimination in the federal laws, most of it based on marital status. The preponderance of perceived discrimination was based on the fact that married working women do not get any larger benefits than married non-working women. As one woman stated:

> I will work my entire life as will my husband and be eligible only for the maximum payments. It would be the same if I had not worked at all. We should each be eligible for benefits based on the individual working.

> Social Security is not to my benefit. My husband collects his and I would like to collect mine. The best thing to do is to get divorced at age 65 and live together.

One woman, in her 30's and single, voiced a generalized anxiety:

> Most people today are getting more than they contributed. I hope the system will have enough for me when I am 65.

Another woman stated:

> I resent as much being taken out of my pay as a man and yet I can't get my own benefits if I'm married.

Even among women who saw Social Security as advantageous to women, in that women can retire at age 62 while a man must wait till 65 to collect full benefits, this perception of discrimination between married and unmarried working women persists. One women complained that as a working woman she could not collect both her own benefits and, as a widow, her widow's benefits. A related area volunteered by some women was the complaint that under Internal Revenue Service rules child care is not deductible. As one woman described:

> I fought against the poor benefits for women. If you're married, you lose part of Social Security benefits. It has criminal results. I could not deduct for child care while I worked. I became divorced and had to support three children. This was a great hardship. I was paying more than half of my salary and it was nondeductible for care of my children.

Several women cited the need for child care centers as part of what they felt was lacking in University policies. One women related that in Poland women have child care for college teachers. As a result of the war they were forced to employ females in formerly male jobs because of the high rate of young male casualties. She also cited that the state there provides a daily nurse for a year after the birth of a child.

Actual Policy

Although the University is bound by Federal Social Security rules, it was deemed relevant to outline the actual policy as it affects women who retire after many years of professional work.

All wage earners contribute the same rate of tax to the Social Security program regardless of marital status, unlike income taxes. Benefits, however, are family-related, assuming the dependence of the wife upon the husband. Thus, the working wife may earn no more retirement benefits than one-half the husband's benefit to which a non-working wife is entitled.[44]

Recommendations

1) The University should inform its women employees of the discriminatory effect of Social Security benefits against working wives, in order to enable them to mobilize, e.g., through the Women's Caucus, to change the federal laws.

Recommendations on Fringe Benefits in General

Overwhelmingly, the most obvious need is to disseminate information about the benefits to which each faculty member is entitled. A simplified summary version should be distributed yearly in order to keep faculty informed and up-to-date, since the discrepancies between the perception of benefits and actual benefits is great in most areas.

It appears that women are less concerned with fringe benefits and their possible differential impact than they are with salary, rank and tenure. Married women, particularly, do not feel a need for most of the benefits since their husbands' coverage includes them. They should be informed of the necessity of their own independent coverage, particularly in the event of divorce, separation or widowhood. Reorientation of women's attitudes is necessary to develop this sense of responsibility.
Some women pride themselves in not caring about financial rewards. They claim they would teach even if they were not paid for it at all. The Women's Caucus could be an effective vehicle for resocialization based on new information, and for mobilization of pressure groups to redress inequities in the law.

XIV Professional Development

Women were asked if they perceived any differences between men and women in the granting of sabbaticals, leaves, travel to conferences or in-service training.

They were also asked for their perceptions of sex discrimination in procuring research grants, presenting papers, publishing books, or other creative or scholarly work. In addition, they were asked to cite any personal experiences they had encountered.

In general, almost 2/3 of the women respondents perceived no discrimination in any of these areas. 18% of the total did not know whether sex discrimination existed in these areas. The remainder did perceive discrimination in one category or another. The percentages differed strongly among campuses with a proportion at Teaneck five times as great perceiving sex discrimination in professional development, compared to Madison.

Sabbaticals

Six women reported having received sabbaticals at the Madison campus, none at Rutherford, and one at Teaneck who reported an upcoming sabbatical, her first in 14 years. Other references to sabbaticals were made by several women who perceived that: no one gets them at their campus; that none were given in her department; that one woman was refused a sabbatical in view of the fact that she had had a maternity leave; and that one noted author here many years had been denied her second sabbatical. Another woman had her sabbatical delayed because of her fight against termination.

Another noted there were no leaves in her department because people don't stay long enough! One woman here many years had asked three times for a one-semester leave to finish her doctorate and was rejected. One woman was planning to ask for a sabbatical for next year but now thinks that it is not automatic and would be more difficult for a woman.

Since approximately 60% of the women respondents have been at the University the six years or more required to be eligible for a sabbatical it is surprising that more of them did not perceive lack of such leaves as a form of discrimination. It is not known whether women have been reluctant to request sabbaticals because of their perceptions that they are not freely granted and because of their fear of replacement. This would be substantiated by their high rate of difficulty in obtaining tenure, promotion and salary increases.

Examples of complaints of discrimination in sabbaticals and leaves.

> I got a leave of absence to work at a research lab and I lost that year toward tenure. Until recently there were high turnovers and firings. No one has been around here long enough to have a sabbatical.

One woman who had a sabbatical with no problems felt there was no discrimination on the questions of tenure, sabbatical and advanced promotion, yet she had never received money for conferences, and was not sure if this was related to her sex.

Several women cited the problems of child care in traveling to conferences. Increasingly, however, professional associations are making provisions for child care for both men and women professionals bringing their families with them.

An example of the process as it omits women is the following:

> Men are definitely preferred. In our department we were never told when conferences were being held nor invited. Men would go to California - we often only learned about it later. If we went to Atlantic City, what we did was inspected carefully and scrutinized. If there was a choice of men or women, the men got it. We didn't know about most conferences. We learned about it later circuitously. We often paid our own expenses and later learned the chairman or another male faculty member had his expenses paid.

Highlighting the nation-wide difference in athletics, one faculty member stated:

> Men go to more national meetings for coaches because there are more organizations involving men in athletics. The women in the department will go to more meetings as the women's teams join national athletic conferences and this sort of thing is now happening at F.D.U.

One woman asked for a sabbatical and received a terminal instead. This woman, a low perceiver of discrimination apparently needed the leave in order to finish her doctorate, to comply with one of the reasons she was told she was being given a terminal:

> The senior committee which voted on my tenure and promotion consisted of all men, except for one woman. The woman voted for my termination on the grounds that I did not have the Ph.D.; however, the rest of the committee voted for termination and then proceeded to recommend a male Instructor without the Ph.D. for both tenure and promotion to Assistant Professor. The male Instructor came to the University after I did. He stated to me that he does not intend ever to get a Ph.D. I have proficiency in two languages while he has only one. I feel that there was no logic in which of the two Instructors was terminated on academic grounds. It was a clear case of a man being chosen over a woman.

Travel to Conferences

Many examples of subtle discrimination were given by women respondents:

> In travel and leaves, women are discriminated against. There is no money for women. The men do get some. Women have to pay their own way. This is true for the Dental School where it is the doctors who receive expenses and the dental hygienists who do not.

> Men find it easier to take time off a great deal.

> It is my impression that men much more often get money for travel to conferences.

> We have had some discrimination in travel and conferences. Expenses are more readily approved for administrators and most of those are men.

Research Grants and Publication

62% of the respondents attributed no discrimination to women procuring research grants or getting published. 14% did not know whether such discrimination existed. The remainder, 24%, felt definite forms of discrimination. These proportions closely matched the respondents' reports that 57% of them had published in the last 3 years in their area of specialization.

Several women reported unsuccessful attempts to have articles or books published.

> It is rough for women to present papers and to publish. In our profession, many men in leading positions who publish and present papers do not have doctorates but women need doctorates in order to get any recognition.

> My work on black English is some of the best that has been done. It was completely ignored by publishers so I published the work myself. The book has done so well it is about to go into a second edition.

Sometimes the discrimination is felt at the department level. Several women in physical education reported perceptions of discrimination because they wanted to do some research and the department thinks such activ i ty is trivial and unnecessary. The bias against scholarly work in general means that they would not get leave to do such work.

To sum up the perceptions of discrimination:

> Women are more isolated from men as mentors; they are not groomed to publish as men are. Women are isolated from the mainstream of the discipline because men are doing the more serious work and prefer men as co-workers. At the University an absence of University facilities and absence of collegiality is notable. Women come handicapped into the competition for publication. They don't know many editors and publishers and depend on the good graces of men to advance them.

Other women have published and felt that the research in the social sciences that women have produced, has received less recognition than that of men particularly citing the qualitative research of women compared to highly quantitative research of men. Several women have published and won awards for their publishing and cited this as evidence that there was no discrimination in publishing.

One successful woman felt that women have to produce superior material, otherwise men's work is recognized first. Yet this woman blamed women themselves for not presenting papers. She felt that women do not take the opportunity to advance to higher positions. Her interviewer felt that this was evidently a woman who had made it and seemed to blame other women if they had not achieved some kind of status. This attitude was recently dubbed "The Queen Bee Syndrome" in *Psychology Today*.[45]

Several women who felt there was no discrimination in these areas blamed the fact that they had not published on their own procrastination, or their own inhibitions which have kept them from writing. These women did not perceive their isolation or absence of encouragement as discrimination and would benefit from institutional support.

Grants

Most of the women who hold grants in the University are in the natural sciences, such as chemistry and biology. Fewer who hold grants are in language, fine arts, psychology and education. Even among those who have grants there was some perception of discrimination in that larger grants seem to go to men. One woman had been declared ineligible for a grant because she only had a one-year contract. Another cited that women had trouble getting grants out of Washington, D.C. One woman stated that no money is given to women working on projects that have been federally funded in the Dental School. Another cited the rejection of child care in her research proposal to enable her to pursue her project. As one woman put it:

> At F.D.U. generally grants go to men unless it's extraordinary. If you have an important sponsor, this will help.

One woman provided insight into the difficulty some women have with research grants:

> I find it extremely hard to fill out the laborious, tedious papers required, although I am now doing so. I don't know the comparable data about my male colleagues but I know I have been remiss in replying. I would like to do research on women and violence, however, and I am planning to prepare a proposal for a faculty grant. I am not knowledgeable about the process of paper presentation. The editors of journals are all men. It's hard to pinpoint any particular experience. I did have a rejection from a journal which is important in my field. The revisions they suggested I felt would destroy the major contentions of the paper. I wrote

> them back telling them this and never heard anything further.

A similar perception was that of the woman who stated:

> I think it is based on the professional reputation of the person involved. I've never asked for any large funds. I did apply last summer for an F.D.U. grant and never received an answer from the administration.

A few women felt that women are almost favored now, one in particular because she was selected by a major national foundation to head a professional institute. She, in turn, selected some women based on their qualifications to assist, yet she did note the lack of women in the field in general and the low level of females competing in scientific endeavors.

It should be noted that approximately 1/3 of the women interviewed had received grants within the last five years, although almost half stated they had not. (The remainder did not respond.) The non-researchers included women in fields such as nursing and physical education where research was not a priority at all.

More than half the women had published within the last five years and a number of them had published a considerable amount of professional materials, including book reviews, articles, monographs and textbooks.

Recommendations

1) Colleagues in all departments should take note of the subtle biases in the system which make it much more difficult for women to become more knowledgeable about

the process of obtaining grants, presenting papers and publishing in order to maximize professional development and growth. 2) The University's central resources, including the Office of Academic Affairs, should particularly focus on aiding women. 3) Women should be encouraged to request travel to conferences, sabbaticals and in-service training.

Women's Movement

Many women noted the impact of the women's movement nationally on their own perceptions and those around them. One woman psychologist challenged the validity of the interview schedule because it did not attempt to differentiate between women who were part of the women's movement and those who were not. Apparently reflecting the view that women in the women's movement tend to be "neurotic women who think they have been discriminated against" (a view held by only 26% of women responding to the Redbook 1972 male questionnaire, with 48% viewing membership in the women's liberation movement made up of well adjusted women with legitimate grievances),[46] one F.D.U. respondent was concerned that some women see everything as discrimination.

About 1/3 of the sample volunteered comments and opinions about the women's movement. Most of those voiced sentiments of sympathy with the movement, or involvement, ranging from peripheral to active. One older woman who was not a member stated that she is aware that she has benefited from the impact of women's organizations. She feels she commands greater respect because students have begun to see women differently. Others were hopeful that because of the presence of the women's movement, the academic situation may change for women.

On the other hand, those who were either bewildered by the movement or hostile to it stated such opinions as:

> Women's lib does not involve me because I am able to make my own way and would recommend that other women behave in a fully competent, professional manner and they too will make it in the world.

When one department chairwoman voluntarily left the chairpersonship, she received spontaneous offers from two feminist organizations who wished to support her in retention of it. She rejected both.

A few women felt doubtful that their interviews would be of any value since they were not part of the liberation movement. One woman who described intense feelings of social isolation from her department was beginning to turn toward the Women's Caucus as an avenue to help her overcome her feelings of non-involvement in the University. This example tended to confirm the perceptions of one active feminist, who stated:

> The respondent seemed to have little use for collective action, but I'm quite sure that in terms of redressing certain kinds of inequality, such as salary inequalities, she would be more than happy to join in collective action.

Women who were on terminal contracts did not necessarily embrace the women's movement. For example, one woman, who was not strongly in favor of women's liberation and does not feel that there is general discrimination against women either at F.D.U. or at other institutions, nevertheless felt that her situation was a strong case of sex discrimination. She compared her own status to that of a comparable man who was promoted, while she was being terminated.

In sum, the status of the women's movement at this University would appear to be at a very embryonic level. Faculty women seized on the appointment of the few women chairpersons, the one woman dean, the one woman vice-president, and the one woman trustee as examples of the changing role and status of women at this University. Yet, the comparison of the statistical data with their perceptions can be presumed as evidence of vast discrepancies between the status of men and women at F.D.U. The data are either unknown to the women interviewed or believed to be the result of immutable societal patterns of male dominance. As pluralistic ignorance gives way to informed awareness, it is probable that women will be more apt to join in collective action to assume their legitimate place in academe.

Reactions to Interview

The fact that a study such as this was being conducted was itself cause for eliciting strong feelings of gratitude on the part of many women. They volunteered their comments and criticism of the kinds of questions that were raised, praising those which forced them to contemplate their own perceptions of sex discrimination. None criticized the fact that such a study was being conducted, nor were many afraid of backlash from male colleagues. But some constructive criticisms were made by women who have done previous attitudinal studies. The chief cause for concern was whether confidentiality could be protected when women are so few and invisible in this institution. This concern was voiced by women at all ends of the spectrum perceiving high discrimination or low discrimination, having full Professor rank or Instructor rank. It was in keeping with the general belief that it had been a long hard climb that is not over, that one must constantly be on the watch and on guard to protect one's status and to avoid arousing collegial displeasure.

. Another reason why women do not protest their status at the University is that some see their sex as an advantage. For example, some women reported that their department head had been protective by avoiding night teaching for them. Some felt that it is easier for a woman to get "around" the men by being feminine and as one woman put it:

> I like being a woman and treated like one -
> It has more advantages than disadvantages.

Several women felt that a competent woman today would probably get more consideration than men, that women have an edge because the market is ripe right now for women writers, and that the government is giving more money for female instructors and students today. The latter comment was offered by one young beneficiary of such an aid program who was leaving the University for advanced opportunity. Some women attribute the situation to "the woman herself", while others do not agree with those women who feel it is "their own fault" that very few women are chosen for leadership positions. A few women, who have served as chairwomen, noted that if they were in that position today, they would definitely increase women's entering salaries. At the time they were the "first" chairwomen they did not feel that courageous, nor all that perceptive of the patterns of discrimination, nor that supportive of other women. If existing patterns are to be broken, considerable re-education and re-socialization of women currently at the University must take place.

On the whole, it is clear that removing institutional barriers would mean more than simply creating opportunities that are equal to men and women.

Summary

The most striking finding of the in-depth interviews was the proportionately low amount of perceived discrimination among women who have clearly been "tracked" along a second-class route to academic success. Their expectations and aspirations have been considerably diluted, judging from the extent of sex differentiation in rank, salary, tenure, promotion and collegial respect. The lack of collegiality influences their low level of demands for recognition in peripheral amenities, such as sabbaticals travel, and fringe benefirs, and prevents them from substantial involvement in decision-making.

On the whole, they are delighted to be part of the academic community and are caught up in the pressures of performing their jobs and fulfilling their home commitments. Their lack of awareness of cumulative deficits experienced by women at F.D.U. leaves them unprepared to assert themselves in their own behalf. Thus, it is necessary for external change agents, such as affirmative action programs and federal guidelines, to come to their assistance.

It is clear that removing institutional barriers would mean more than simply creating opportunities that are equal to men and women. They require incentives in the form of role models, and rectification of past inequities.

The recommendations, therefore, go beyond legal requirements which must receive compliance. They include areas in which the data suggest implicit solutions to the problems revealed, and which have not yet been analyzed by social scientists.

All recommendations are those of the Project Director, after consultation with women's rights organizations outside the University and officials within. They are designed as a starting point for internal dialogue among constituencies of women and men faculty, administrators, staff and students.

Because of the emerging restructuring of relations between the administration and faculty as a result of collective bargaining and affirmative action, the need for specific mechanisms to redress past inequities can only be suggested. Collective bargaining and affirmative action groups should respond to each area. While affirmative action has specific federal guidelines, collective bargaining has more latitude in negotiating.

In addition to a high-ranking affirmative action officer in central administration, each campus should have a full-time affirmative action specialist to gather and disseminate data; educate faculty, staff, students and administrators; and monitor implementation of an affirmative action plan. The monitoring process is crucial to the effectiveness of the plan and requires procedures employing uniform criteria for recruitment, hiring, promotion, tenure and salary.

While all recommendations in the report deal with women, they should be construed to apply equally to other minorities as well. Racial minorities, including blacks, Spanish-speaking, Mexican-Americans and Asian-Americans, have also suffered cultural and economic discrimination. These groups also share the reluctance of some of the successful members of both groups to assist younger and more militant members to attain more satisfactory situations.[47] But, while racial minorities can indeed develop a separatist way of life, women are economically, socially and psychologically more dependent upon men. It is incumbent on women to build group solidarity to increase women's sensitivity to their plight. It is also incumbent on male-dominated administrators to demonstrate the leadership required to anticipate the demands inevitably to come from women and improve their status accordingly.

APPENDIX

Description of Respondents Interviewed

Table 1. Percentage of Full-time Faculty Women Interviewed.

	Interviewed	Refused Interview	# of Women Faculty	% of Women Interviewed
Madison	18	0	20	90%
Rutherford	26	4	36	72%
Teaneck	34	6	44	77%
Total	78	10	100	78%

APPENDIX

Table 2. Respondents Rank
% of Women Respondents

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
	% of Women	% of Women	% of Women	% of Women
Professor	10%	6%	8%	15%
Assoc. Prof.	27%	28%	35%	20%
Assist. Prof.	46%	50%	34%	53%
Instructor	17%	16%	23%	12%

APPENDIX

Respondents Tenure

40% of the women interviewed had tenure while 60% did not. The Madison Campus had substantially fewer women with tenure included in the sample than at either of the other campuses (22% compared to 50% at Rutherford and 41% at Teaneck).

Table 3. Respondents tenure

	Univ.	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Had tenure	40%	22%	50%	41%
Did not have tenure	60%	78%	50%	59%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Salary

Distribution of the respondents by salary category was as follows: $20,000 to $25,000, 10.3%; $17,000 to $19,999, 26.9%; $14,000 to $16,999, 25.6%; $11,000 to $13,999, 34.6%; and under $10,999, 2.6%. At the highest end of the scale, no Woman earned $25,000 and over. The largest percentage at each campus fell within the $11,000 to $13,999 category, except for Rutherford where the largest number earned $14,000 to $16,999 and where no woman interviewed earned under $10,999.

Table 4. Respondents by Salary

	#	University %	Madison %	Rutherford %	Teaneck %
$25,000 +	0	0	0	0	0
20,000 - 24,999	8	10	6	8	15
17,000 - 19,999	21	27	22	30	27
14,000 - 16,999	20	26	28	35	18
11,000 - 13,999	27	35	39	27	38
under 10,999	2	2	5	0	2
Total	78				

APPENDIX

Respondents Age

The largest percentage of respondents was in the age grouping of 41 to 50 years of age (35.5%). The next largest grouping was that 51 to 60 years of age (25%). 24% of the sample were 31 to 40 years of age. 12% were under 30 and only 4% were over 60 years of age. Sizable differences among the campuses were noted, particularly at Madison, where there were no women in the over 60 group and at Rutherford, which had more than twice as many in that age group than Teaneck. At the other end of the spectrum there were only 4% of the under 30's at Rutherford, compared to 11% at Madison and 19% at Teaneck under 30. Teaneck's respondent population was most heavily concentrated in the 41 to 50 age grouping while Rutherford's dominant age group was 51 to 60.

Table 5. Respondents by Age

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
under 31	12%	11%	4%	19%
31 - 40	24%	33%	23%	19%
41 - 50	35%	33%	27%	44%
51 - 60	25%	22%	38%	16%
over 60	4%	0%	8%	3%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Marital Status

University-wide, more than half the respondents were married(56%) with 25% single, 5% separated, 8% divorced, 3% remarried and 3% widowed. Campus differences were notably that 65% of Teaneck respondents were married, considerably more than the Rutherford and Madison campuses. At Madison far more women respondents were in the separated status (17%) compared to 0 at Rutherford and 3% at Teaneck. Also there were no divorced or remarried women in the sample at Madison.

Table 6. Respondents by Marital Status

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Married	56%	50%	50%	65%
Single	25%	28%	34%	17%
Separated	5%	17%	0%	3%
Divorced	8%	0%	8%	12%
Remarried	3%	0%	4%	3%
Widowed	3%	5%	4%	0%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Number of Children

Almost half the respondents have no children (44%) with 10% having 1 child, 32% having 2 children, 10% with 3 children and 4% with 4 or more. Noting campus differences, at Rutherford there were no respondents with 2 children. Teaneck has the highest proportion of women with no children (65%)

Table 7. Respondents by Number of Children

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
No children	44%	56%	54%	65%
1 child	10%	17%	33%	6%
2 children	32%	22%	0%	17%
3 children	10%	5%	8%	9%
4 or more	4%	0%	4%	3%

APPENDIX

Number of Children Currently at Home

This category for which there were 31 total respondents, the bulk had 2 children at home (48%) with 36% having 1 child at home and 16% with 3 children at home. Thus, of the 44 women with children, 31 or almost 75% of them apparently have children at home. That bulk of respondents with children are at the Teaneck campus and the fewest at Madison. 58% of the Teaneck women have 2 children at home.

Table 8. Number of Children at Home

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
1	36%	50%	50%	26%
2	48%	50%	25%	58%
3	16%	0%	25%	16%

Respondents' Department

Respondents were drawn from 15 departments in the total University. The sample ranged from 1 to 13 in any given department with the largest category including Social Science, Social Welfare, History and Philosophy, which at some campuses are separated and at others unified. The largest percentage of respondents were in Social Science, in Education, in Language and in Psychology. None of the remaining departments represented as much as 10% of our sample respondents.

APPENDIX

Respondents' College

Among the respondents 83% were in the College of Arts and Sciences, 13% in Education, 3% in Business and 1% in Dentristry with no respondents from the Science and Engineering college.

Table 9. Respondents by College

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Arts & Sciences	83%	83%	76%	82%
Education	13%	17%	21%	8%
Business	3%	0%	3%	3%
Science & Engineering	0%	0%	0%	0%
Dentristry	1%	0%	0%	6%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Degree

The highest degree, Ph.D. or Ed. D., was held by 45% of the sample with 42% having attained the M.A. or Masters and 13% the B.A. or B.S. degree. Campus variations were notable in that at Teaneck 62%, at Madison 44%, and at Rutherford only 28% of the sample have the highest degree.

Table 10. Respondents' Degree

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Ph.D.	45%	44%	28%	62%
M.A.	42%	50%	66%	32%
B.A.	13%	6%	6%	6%

7

APPENDIX

Respondents' Time in Rank

Three categories were established for time in rank and applied to the sample. Based on the average time in rank established statistically for the entire population of the University, the first category was defined as those longer in rank than the average; the second category the average time in rank; and the third, shorter time in rank.

Most of the women in the sample fell into the category longer in rank than average (70%). Only 11% had been in rank the average length of time for all University faculty members and 19% of the sample had been a shorter length of time than average. Differences among campuses noted were: at Rutherford where 83% of the women respondents had been longer in rank than the average compared to 65% at Teaneck and 54% at Madison sharing that category. Madison had far more women who had spent the average time in rank than the other campuses, (23%), compared to Rutherford, (9%), and Teaneck (5%). At Teaneck 30% of the respondents had spent a shorter time in rank than the average compared to 23% at Madison and only 8% at Rutherford.

APPENDIX

Table 11. Respondents' Time in Rank

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Longer than Average	70%	54%	83%	65%
Average	11%	23%	9%	5%
Shorter than Average	19%	23%	8%	30%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Years at F.D.U.

Respondents were grouped into 6 categories as follows: 13% - under 3 years, 26% - 3 to 5 years; 35% - 6 to 8 years; 15% - 9 to 12 years; 10% - 13 to 20 years; and 1% over 20 years. Among the campuses Madison had the most recently hired women faculty with 39% under 3 years. There were no women at Madison longer than 12 years. At Rutherford there were no women under 3 years at the University. At Teaneck there were no women over 20 years.

Table 12. Respondents' Years at F.D.U.

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
under 3 years	13%	39%	0%	9%
3 - 5	26%	11%	31%	20%
6 - 8	35%	33%	27%	41%
9 - 12	15%	17%	27%	6%
13 - 20	10%	0%	11%	15%
over 20	1%	0%	4%	0%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Publication

Respondents were asked whether they had published since their first professional appointment and during the last 3 years in their area of specialization. In the University-wide sample, 57% had published and 43% had not. Campus differences included: at Teaneck 64% had published, at Madison, 63% and at Rutherford 43%. Thus at only one campus, Rutherford, a majority of women had not published.

Table 13. Respondents' Publications

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Had published	57%	63%	43%	64%
Had not published	43%	37%	57%	36%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Research

Respondents were asked if they had received research grants or awards since their first professional appointment and during the last five years. In this category more respondents had not done research than had, 59% compared to 41%. Among the campuses, Madison and Teaneck, both had a majority who had received research grants, 53% and 54% respectively with Rutherford women only 27% having similar experience.

Table 14. Respondents' Research

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Had done research	41%	53%	27%	54%
Had not done research	59%	47%	73%	46%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Fellowships and Assistantships

The majority of respondents had never received an assistantship or fellowship (52%). Madison respondents, however, reversed the pattern with 64% having received an assistantship or fellowship compared to 43% each at Rutherford and Teaneck.

Table 15. Respondents' Fellowships and Assistantships

	University	Madison	Rutherford	Teaneck
Had received a fellowship and/or assistantship	48%	64%	43%	43%
Had not received a fellowship and/or assistantship	52%	36%	57%	57%

APPENDIX

Respondents' Career Interruptions

Although this category of information was not solicited it was determined to bear on the pattern experienced by women faculty members at F.D.U. Reconstructed data indicate that approximately 24 of the 43 married women with children for whom career pattern data was available experienced some degree of career interruption ranging from one year to as much as 28 years. It appeared that approximately half the women who had career interruptions were at home for 10 years or less with the other half falling somewhere between 10 and the 28 year maximum rate. 17 married women with children revealed no career interruptions and no information could be gleaned for the remainder. Data are incomplete. Included in those with no career interruptions are several women who changed vocations during the course of their lifetimes and those who were able to continue their careers on a free lance basis.

APPENDIX

Table 16 Distribution of Promotions between Men and Women Faculty, 1968-1973.

	Promotion to:	Number of Promotions	Men		Women	
			N	%	N	%
1972 - 1973	Professor	0	-	-	-	-
	Associate Prof.	17	16	94.1	1	5.9
	Assistant Prof.	28	18	64.3	10	35.7
	Instructor	15	12	80.0	3	20.0
	Total	60	46	76.7	14	23.3

Total Faculty: 488; 79.2% men; 20.8% women

	Promotion to:	Number of Promotions	Men		Women	
			N	%	N	%
1971 - 1972	Professor	0	-	-	-	-
	Associate Prof.	8	8	100.0	-	-
	Assistant Prof.	23	18	78.3	5	21.7
	Instructor	13	9	69.2	4	30.8
	Total	44	35	79.5	9	20.4

Total Faculty: 471; 78.3% men; 21.7% women

	Promotion to:	Number of Promotions	Men		Women	
			N	%	N	%
1970 - 1971	Professor	0	-	-	-	-
	Associate Prof.	12	10	83.3	2	16.7
	Assistant Prof.	24	24	100.0	-	-
	Instructor	15	10	66.7	5	33.3
	Total	51	44	86.3	7	13.7

Total Faculty: 455; 77.8% men; 22.2% women

	Promotion to:	Number of Promotions	Men		Women	
			N	%	N	%
1969 - 1970	Professor	0	-	-	-	-
	Associate Prof.	17	13	76.5	4	23.5
	Assistant Prof.	26	22	84.6	4	15.4
	Instructor	19	15	78.[illegible]	4	21.1
	Total	62	50	80.6	12	19.4

Total Faculty: 453; 77.5% men; 22.5% women

APPENDIX

Table 16
(cont'd)

	Promotion to:	Number of Promotions	Men N	Men %	Women N	Women %
1968 - 1969	Professor	0	-	-	-	-
	Associate Prof.	10	9	90.0	1	10.0
	Assistant Prof.	32	29	90.6	3	9.4
	Instructor	13	10	76.9	3	23.1
	Total	55	48	87.3	7	12.7

Total Faculty: 459; 79.5% men; 20.5% women

APPENDIX

Table 17 Distribution of Promotions of Men and Women with Ph.D., 1968-69 through 1972-73

	# Men Promoted w Ph.D.	# Fac. Men w Ph.D.	% Men Compared to #Ph.D.	# Women Promoted w Ph.D.	# Fac. Women w Ph.D.	% Women Compared to # Ph.D.
			University-wide			
1972-73	31	225	13.8	7	37	18.9
1971-72	29	196	14.8	4	38	10.5
1970-71	25	174	14.4	1	35	2.9
1969-70	31	164	18.9	2	32	6.3
1968-69	23	171	13.5	2	27	7.4
			Madison			
1972-73	9	58	15.5	1	8	12.5
1971-72	3	52	5.8	1	9	11.1
1970-71	4	44	9.1	1	7	14.3
1969-70	8	41	19.5	0	7	0
1968-69	7	44	15.9	1	7	14.3
			Rutherford			
1972-73	3	43	7.0	1	9	11.1
1971-72	2	36	5.6	0	10	0
1970-71	7	31	22.6	0	12	0
1969-70	7	33	21.2	1	11	9.1
1968-69	2	31	6.5	1	4	25.0
			Teaneck			
1972-73	19	124	15.3	5	20	25.0
1971-72	24	108	22.2	3	19	15.8
1970-71	14	99	14.1	0	16	0
1969-70	16	90	17.8	1	14	7.1
1968-69	14	96	14.6	0	16	0

Table 18

Full-time Faculty Who Got Promotion by Rank
1968-69 Through 1972-73

	With Ph.D.								Without Ph.D.							
	Men				Women				Men				Women			
	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women
								University-wide								
1972-73	31	6.4			7	1.4			16	3.3			6	1.2		
Assoc.	9		5.4	2.3	1		0.6	1.0	3		1.8	0.8	0			
Asst.	13		7.3	3.3	5		2.8	4.9	5		2.8	1.3	4		2.2	
Instr.	7		13.7	1.8	1		2.0	1.0	6		11.8	1.5	1		2.0	
Other	2				0				2				1			
1971-72	29	6.1			4	0.8			10	2.1			5	1.1		
Assoc.	8		5.5	2.2	0				1		0.7	0.3	0			
Asst.	14		7.4	3.8	2		1.1	2.0	5		2.6	1.3	3		1.6	2.9
Instr.	5		8.3	1.3	1		1.7	1.0	4		6.7	1.1	2		3.3	2.0
Other	2				1				0				0			
1970-71	26	5.7			1				21				6	1.3		
Assoc.	9		6.9	2.5	1		0.8	1.0	3		2.3	0.8	1		0.8	1.0
Asst.	12		6.5	3.4					13		7.1	3.7	0			
Instr.	4		5.6	1.1					5		7.0	1.4	5		7.0	4.9
Other	1								0				0			

Table 18 (continued)

	With Ph.D.								Without Ph.D.							
	Men				Women				Men				Women			
	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women
1969-70	31	6.8			2	0.4			20	4.4			10	2.2		
Assoc.	13		11.4	3.7	1				2		1.7	0.6	1		0.9	1.0
Asst.	13		6.8	3.7	1				9		4.7	2.5	3		1.6	2.9
Instr.	4		4.4	1.1					9		10.0	2.6	4		4.4	3.9
Other	1												2			
1968-69	23	5.0			2	0.4			24	5.2			7	1.5		
Assoc.	7		6.4	1.9					2		1.8	0.5	1		0.9	1.1
Asst.	13		6.2	3.6	1		0.5	1.1	14		6.6	3.3	4		1.9	4.2
Instr.	2		2.0	0.5	1		1.0	1.1	8		8.0	2.2	1		1.0	1.1
Other	1												1			1.1
Madison Campus																
1972-73	9	1.8			1	0.2			1	0.2			2	0.4		
Assoc.	2		4.4	2.1												
Asst.	5		11.4	5.2	1		2.3	4.8					1		2.3	4.8
Instr.	1		6.7	1.0					1		6.7	1.0				
Other	1												1			
1971-72	3	2.7			1	0.9			3	2.7			0			
Assoc.	0															
Asst.	2		3.7	2.1	1		1.9	5.9	1		1.9	1.1				
Instr.	1		7.7	1.1					2		15.4	2.1				
Other	0															

Table 18 (continued)

	With Ph.D.								Without Ph.D.							
	Men				Women				Men				Women			
	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women
1970-71	4	3.9			1	1.0			8	7.8			2	1.9		
Assoc.	1		3.3	1.1	1.		10.0	6.3	2		6.7	2.3				
Asst.	3		5.8	3.4					4		7.7	4.6				
Instr.	1		9.1	1.1					2		18.2	2.3	2		18.2	12.5
Other	0															
1969-70	8	7.3							4	3.7			0			
Assoc.	2		8.3	2.4					1		4.2	1.2				
Asst.	5		9.6	6.0					1		1.9	1.2				
Instr.									2		10.5	2.4				
1968-69	7	6.3			1	0.9			4	3.6			3	2.7		
Assoc.	2		9.5	2.2									1		4.8	4.5
Asst.	4		6.3	4.5	1		1.6	4.5	3		4.8	3.4	1		1.6	4.5
Instr.	1		4.3	1.1					1		4.3	1.1	1		4.3	4.5
Other	0															
Rutherford Campus																
1972-73	3	2.4			1	0.8			8	6.5			4	3.2		
Assoc.	1		2.3	1.1					1		2.3	1.1				
Asst.					1		2.1	2.8	3		6.2	3.4	3		6.2	8.3
Instr.	1		5.6	1.1					3		16.7	3.4	1		5.6	2.8
Other (L.A.-F.T.)	1								1							

Table 18 (continued)

	With Ph.D.								Without Ph.D.							
	Men				Women				Men				Women			
	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women
1971-72	2	1.6							2	1.6			1	0.8		
Assoc.	0															
Asst.	2		4.1	2.4					2		4.1	2.4				
Instr.													1		4,5	2,6
Other	0															
1970-71	7	5.7							6	4.9			1	0.8		
Assoc.	4		10.8	4.9					1		2.7	1.2	1		2.7	2.4
Asst.	2		4.4	2.5					3		6.7	3.7				
Instr.	1		4.0	1.2					2		8.0	2.5				
Other	0															
1969-70	7	5.4			1	0.8			5	3.8			6	6.1		
Assoc.	3		7.5	3.6												
Asst.	3		6.4	3.6	1		2.1	2.2	3		6.4	3.6	3		6.4	6.5
Instr.	1		3.0	1.2					2		6.1	2.4	3		9.1	6.5
Other	0															
1968-69	2	1.6			1	0.8			7	5.6			3	2.4		
Assoc.	1		2.3	1.1												
Asst.	1		1.9	1.1					4		7.7	4.6	2		3.8	5.4
Instr.					1		2.8	2.7	3		8.3	3.4				
Other													1			

Table 18 (continued)

	With Ph.D.								Without Ph.D.							
	Men				Women				Men				Women			
	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Men	N	% Total M&W	% # in Rank	% # Total Women
Teaneck Campus																
1972-73	19	7.7			5	2.0			7	2.8			0			
Assoc.	6		7.7	2.9	1		1.3	2.2	2		2.6	1.0				
Asst.	8		9.2	3.9	3		3.4	6.7	2		2.3	1.0				
Instr.	5		27.5	2.5	1		5.6	2.2	2		11.1	1.0				
Other									1							
1971-72	24	10.1			3	1.3			5	2.1			4	1.7		
Assoc.	8		10.9	4.2					1		1.4	0.5				
Asst.	10		11.5	5.2	1		1.1	2.2	2		2.3	1.0	3		3.4	6.5
Instr.	4		16.0	2.1	1		4.0	2.2	2		8.0	1.0	1		4.0	2.2
Other	2				1											
1970-71	14	6.1							7	3.1			3	1.3		
Assoc.	4		6.3	2.1												
Asst.	7		8.0	3.8					6		6.9	3.2				
Instr.	2		5.7	1.1					1		2.9	0.5	3		8.6	7.0
Other	1															
1969-70	16	7.3			1	0.5			11	5.0			2	0.9		
Assoc.	8		16.0	4.3	1		2.0	2.8	1		2.0	0.5	1		2.0	2.8
Asst.	5		5.4	2.8					5		5.4	2.7				
Instr.	3		7.7	1.6q					5		12.8	2.7	1		2.6	2.8
Other	0															
1968-69	14	6.3							13	5.8			1	0.4		
Assoc.	4		6.9	2.1					2		3.4	1.0				
Asst.	8		8.3	4.2					7		7.3	3.7	1		1.0	2.3
Instr.	1		2.4	0.5					4		9.7	2.1				
Other	1															

Table 1[illegible]

Comparison of Total Years Faculty Service Men and Women
by Rank, by Campus 1972-73

	Instructor				Asst. Prof.				Assoc. Prof.				Professor			
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women
								I. University-wide								
Years																
0-1	8	25.8	4	21.1	21	15.6	4	9.3	10	7.2	2	6.9	3	3.6	0	
2-3	11	35.5	4	21.1	32	23.7	10	23.2	13	9.4	1	3.4	3	3.6	0	
4-5	7	22.6	6	31.6	32	23.7	[illegible]	9.3	15	10.9	8	27.6	4	4.8	0	
6-7	5	16.1	5	26.3	26	11.1	11	25.6	32	23.2	4	13.8	5	5.9	0	
8-9					15	11.1	11	25.6	26	18.8	6	20.7	7	8.3	1	11.1
10-11					5	3.7	1	2.3	18	15.0	2	6.9	14	16.7	0	
12-15					3	2.2	2	4.7	16	11.6	4	13.8	29	34.5	4	44.4
16-20					1	0.7			7	5.1	2	6.9	16	19.0	4	44.4
21-30									1	0.7	0		3	3.6	0	

Table 19 (continued)

	Instructor				Asst. Prof.				Assoc. Prof.				Professor			
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women
						II. Madison Campus										
0-1	2	18.2	3	75.0	5	14.3	1	11.1	4	10.5	1	14.3				
2-3	5	45.4	0		11	31.4	2	22.2	2	5.3	0		1	8.3	0	
4-5	2	18.2	0		10	28.6	0		5	13.2	4	57.1	1	8.3	0	
6-7	2	18.2	1	25.0	8	22.9	5	55.6	6	15.8	1	14.3	1	8.3	0	
8-9					1	2.9	0		11	28.9	0		0		0	
10-11					0		1	11.1	4	10.5	0		2	16.7	0	
12-15									5	13.2	1	14.3	6	50.0	1	100.0
16-20									1	2.6	0		1	8.3	0	
						III. Rutherford Campus										
0-1	4	40.0	0		7	20.6	2	15.4	2	6.3	0		1	7.7	0	
2-3	2	20.0	1	12.5	9	26.5	2	15.4	0		0		0		0	
4-5	3	30.0	6	75.0	4	11.8	1	7.7	1	3.1	2	16.7	1	7.7	0	
6-7	1	10.0	1	12.5	7	20.6	3	23.1	9	28.1	0		0		0	
8-9					6	17.6	5	38.5	5	15.6	4	33.3	0		0	
10-11					1	2.9	0		7	21.9	2	16.7	1	7.7	0	
12-15									4	12.5	3	25.0	3	23.1	0	
16-20									3	9.4	1	8.3	6	46.2	2	100.
21-30									1	3.1	0		1	7.7	0	

Table 19 (continued)

	Instructor				Asst. Prof.				Assoc. Prof.				Professor			
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women	N	% of Men	N	% of Women
							IV. Teaneck Campus									
0-1	2	20.0	1	14.3	9	13.6	1	4.8	4	5.9	1	10.0	2	3.4	0	
2-3	4	40.0	3	42.8	12	18.2	6	28.6	11	16.2	1	10.0	2	3.4	0	
4-5	2	20.0	0		18	27.3	3	14.3	9	13.2	2	20.0	2	3.4	0	
6-7	2	20.0	3	42.8	11	16.7	3	14.3	17	25.0	3	30.0	4	6.8	0	
8-9					8	12.1	6	28.6	10	14.7	2	20.0	7	11.9	1	16.
10-11					4	6.1	0		7	10.3	0		11	18.6	0	
12-15					3	4.5	2	9.5	7	10.3	0		20	33.9	3	50.
16-20					1	1.5	0		3	4.4	1	10.0	9	15.2	2	33.
21-30													2	3.4	0	

FOOTNOTES

1 Pamela Roby, "Institutional Barriers to Women in Higher Education", *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood, (New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1973) p. 37.

2 *Ibid*. p. 39.

3 *Ibid*. p. 39.

4 *Ibid*. p. 40.

5 The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Opportunities for Women in Higher Education: Their Current Participation, Prospects for the Future, and Recommendations for Action* (New York, McGraw - Hill Book, Co., 1973) p. 1.

6 Alice S. Rossi, "Report of Committee W, 1972-73: *AAUP Bulletin*, Vol. 59, No. 2, Summer 1973, p. 1972.

7 Roby, *op. cit*., p. 40.

8 Roby op. cit., p. 38-39.

9 *Ibid*, p. 46.

10 Cynthia L. Attwood, *Women in Fellowship and Training Programs*, (Washington, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1972) p. 2.

11 Roby, *op. cit*., p. 50.

12 Attwood, *op. cit*., p. 5.

13 Roby, *op. cit*., p. 54.

14 Lora H. Robinson, "Institutional Variations in the Status of Academic Women", *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Alice P. Rossi and Ann Calderwood, (New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1973) p. 204.

15 Helen S. Astin and Alan E. Bayer, "Sex Discrimination in Academe", *Educational Record*, Spring 1972, p. 115.

16 Rossi, *op. cit*., p. 348.

17 Robinson, *op. cit*., p. 216.

18 The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, op. cit., p. 119.

19 *Ibid*. p. 119.

20 Rossi, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

21 Laura Morlock in Rossi, p. 274.

22 Astin and Bayer, op. cit. Rossi p. 350.

23 U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Higher Education Guidelines. Executive Order 11246, p. 1.

24 Sociology: Human Society - Melvin L. DeFleur, William D'Antonio & Lois B. DeFleur (Glenview, Ill., Scott Foresman & Co.) p. 216:'73.

25 Majorie Galenson, Women and Work: An International Comparison, Ithaca, New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1973, p. 24.

26 Vidich and Bensman - Small Town in Mass Society Personality & Minimization of Personality Conflicts, p.302.

27 90% of the women and 78% of the men surveyed felt that teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary basis for faculty promotion. Alan E. Bayers, Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73, American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 8,2, 1973.

28 The Record, August 14, 1973

29 Cynthia Epstein - A Woman's Place, p. 22.

30 Ibid. p. 24.

31 Status is measured by rank, salary and tenure.

32 These four patterns are not mutually exclusive and exhaustive but provide insights necessary to address the solution of the social problem of institutional sexism in academe.

33 James Carter, Special Assistant to the President. "Report to the Executive Committee: An Approach to the Solution of the Problem of Personnel Underutilization.", p. 18.

34 The Case for Positive Discrimination", S.M. Miller Social Policy - Nov/Dec 1973, p. 71.

35 John Rawls, A Theory of Justice 1971, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., P.302.

36 Report of Committee W. 1972-73. AAUP Bulletin, June 1973, p. 173.

37 Memo from University Director of Personnel to Dr. Lora Liss, October 22, 1973.

38 Interview with Vice-President of Academic Affairs, March 9, 1973.

39 Interview with Assistant Vice-President for Academic Services, March 9, 1973.

40 "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex" Federal Register, vol. 37, no. 66, April 5, 1972. (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission).

41 Astin and Bayer, *op. cit.* p. 348 Rossi.

42 *op. cit.* memo Director of Personnel.

43 *op. cit.* memo Director of Personnel.

44 Carolyn Bell, "Social Security: Myth and Reality", *The Record*, September 23, 1973.

45 "The Queen Bee Syndrome", Graham Staines, Carol Tavris and Toby Epstein Jayaratne, *Psychology Today*, (January 1974) p. 55-60.

46 "What 120,000 Young Women Can Tell You About Sex, Motherhood, Menstruation, Housework - and Men", Carol Tavris and Toby Jayaratne, *Redbook*, January 1973.

47 Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Women in Academe", Warner Modular Publication Reprint 579, 1973.

STATUS OF WOMEN AT FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Prepared by Professor Lora Liss, Sociology, Teaneck

Name of Interviewee: ______________________________

1. Views about women in academe

a. Perceptions of interviewee on the relative freedom and opportunities of men and women in academia:

(1) in general; at other institutions; at Fairleigh Dickinson University.

(2) in field of specialization; at other institutions; at Fairleigh Dickinson University.

(3) as faculty, administrators, or trustees.

2. Previous graduate student and career choices

Perceptions of sex awareness in selecting major, graduate school, and career choices.

3. Marital status

a. Perceptions of effects of marital status on women in academia, relative to men.

b. Personal experiences of home-career conflicts.

4. Preferred activities at Fairleigh Dickinson University

a. Interviewee's perception of actual time allotted to each of the following functions compared to preferred allotment:

b. Perception of differences from male colleagues' allocations:

(1) Teaching	(4) Counselling or advisement
(2) Research	(5) Creative activity
(3) Writing	(6) Committee service

5. Departmental sex differentiation

Interviewee's perceptions of sex differentiation relative to her male colleagues in each of the following departmental areas:

a. Class or teaching schedule

b. Load of major advisees

c. Load of graduate advisees

d. Counselling assignments

e. Honors mentorships

f. Independent study supervision

g. Thesis advisement

h. Substitution teaching

i. Departmental committee assignments

j. Office space

k. Secretarial assistance

l. Equipment

m. Other

6. College and University service

a. Interviewee's perceptions of sex discrimination in appointment or election of women to college and university committees.

b. Personal experiences of sex discrimination in relation to committee appointment or election.

c. General perceptions and personal experiences with male colleagues undervaluing women's contributions to committee deliberations.

7. Personnel decisions

a. Interviewee's perceptions of differential treatment in relation to hiring, continuing appointment, promotion, entrance level salary and tenure.

b. Personal experiences of sex discrimination in personnel decisions.

c. Perception of extent of recruitment and advertising effort by university and department to locate women faculty or administrators.

8. Sex discrimination in university policies

a. Interviewee's knowledge of existing university policies in the following areas and perceptions of the benefits or deficiencies resulting to women academics, compared to desired benefits.

(1) Nepotism

(2) Maternity leave (or miscarriage, pregnancy, abortion)

(3) Sick leave or temporary disability

(4) Loss of seniority

(5) Life insurance benefits available

(6) Hospitalization benefits available

(7) Pension and retirement rights available

(8) Social Security benefits available

b. Personal experiences with the above policies.

9. Professional development

a. Perceptions of differentiation between men and women in the granting of sabbaticals, leaves, travel to conferences, or in-service training.

b. Personal experiences with above.

c. Perceptions of sex discrimination in procuring research grants, presenting or publishing papers, books, or other creative or scholarly work.

d. Personal experiences with above.

10. Demographic data

Confirm data available. Complete missing data.

(1) Age

(2) Marital status (m.s.w.d.s.)

(3) Number of children: (4) Ages (living with interviewee ?)

(5) Years at FDU (6) Total years relevant experience teaching and/or professional employment related to field.

(7) Years in current department (name of department and field of specialization).

(8) Salary

(9) Rank

(10) Tenure

(11) Time in each rank held at FDU

(12) Highest degree (year conferred)

(enrolled in doctoral program; in preparation for candidacy; candidate for degree; dissertation in progress; date degree expected)

(13) Publications since first professional appointment and during last three years in area of specialization: (books, texts, articles in professional journals, reviews in professional journals, nonprofessional publications.)

(14) Research grants or awards since first professional appointment and during last five years.

(15) Fellowships, Assistantships.

Comments:

Interviewer's Comments: